

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

---

VOL. I.

No. 4.

---

## I.—THE *NEAPOLITANUS* OF PROPERTIUS.<sup>1</sup>

It would be difficult to find two editors more completely dissimilar in scope and treatment than Herr Bährens and Mr. A. Palmer. The former is revolutionary, the latter conservative. Bährens flings aside the venerated traditions of the school of Lachmann and Haupt; declares the Naples MS., on which Lachmann mainly and Haupt almost exclusively based the constitution of the text of Propertius, interpolated; and after an enlarged examination of the many codices in different libraries, selects four, either unknown or never thoroughly collated before, as authoritative sources for future editors, merely admitting the Naples MS. as a pendant to these—chiefly, it would seem, from the high authority which has been assigned to it for half a century. Mr. Palmer, himself the rediscoverer of the long lost codex which Cujas lent Scaliger, and which is known to scholars as the Cujacianus, is satisfied with giving a complete collation of this (which he renames Perusinus), while he bases his edition almost exclusively on the Naples MS., reëxamined by him specially for his edition. But the two editions are opposed to each other, not merely as exhibiting directly antagonistic views as to the value of the MS. sources of the poet's text, but even more as regards the

<sup>1</sup> Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV. Recensuit Aemilius Bährens. Leipzig, Teubner. 1880.

Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV. Recensuit A. Palmer, Collegii Trinitatis iuxta Dublinum Socius. London, G. Bell. 1880.

treatment of the poems. Mr. Palmer, in spite of the bold tone of his articles in *Hermathena*, ends with a text which on the whole deviates but slightly from those with which we are familiar. Herr Bährens, on the other hand, believing that the poems have come down to us in a form widely removed from that in which the poet left them, introduces a large number of lacunae, transpositions and alterations. Both editors contribute a considerable stock of new emendations; many of them plausible, many very improbable, some few likely to remain as, if not certain restitutions, at least unusually clever *rifaccimenti*.

It will be seen from the above sketch that neither work can be dispensed with by anybody who intends to study the problem of the Propertian poems *de novo*. To determine the relative importance of Bährens' four new MSS. will require much patient investigation. To form a new and modified estimate of the Neapolitanus will equally demand long scrutiny. To assign its proper place to the Perusinus is not a matter which can be settled by an *ipse dixit*. I hold it to be a real error in Bährens to discard all MSS. as useless of which he cannot confidently pronounce that they are uninterpolated. But interpolation is a matter of degree, as any one familiar with MSS. will soon discover. And no statement about interpolation that I have ever seen, however much of truth it may contain, is so absolutely true as not to admit disproof in particular cases. For instance, it may be true, *as a rule*, that XVth century MSS. are liable to be interpolated, and more liable as they recede more and more from the beginning and approach nearer to the end of the century. But the rule is open to the most marked and indisputable exceptions. The well-known Datanus of Catullus was written after 1470, and yet presents, as a whole, such indisputable marks of genuine antiquity as to rank it, in the judgment of the great majority of critics, in the first class of Catullian codices. Again, there are cases in which Catullian MSS. of the middle XVth century seem to have preserved relics of ancient orthography which have disappeared in MSS. of an earlier date. Thus in the last strophe of Catullus' Hymn to Diana the two XIVth century codices (GO) have *solita es*, two middle XVth *solitas es (est)*, i. e. as L. Müller seems rightly to point out, the old form *solita's* side by side with the later *solita es*. One of the most difficult questions probably in classical criticism would be to determine the amount of interpolation which makes a MS. of any one of the amatory works of Ovid worthless. For owing to their immense celebrity, the perfection of their style, the

interest of the subject, they were probably more read and copied from the very earliest times than anything in Roman literature with the single exception of Virgil. It was inevitable that a great variety of readings should by degrees find their way into the MSS. These readings are as false as corrections introduced by the Renaissance copyists of the XVth century. But they occur in very early MSS., and have in a sense the sanction of antiquity. Hence readings as obviously *made up* as the famous *oculos, sidera nostra, tuos* in the Amores for the real reading *oculos qui rapuere meos*, not only find admission in modern editions, but are scarcely eliminated after long and patient determination. Yet it remains true that a MS. is less liable to be interpolated in proportion to its age, and that a sixth century codex is more precious than a seventh because it has the advantage of a century.

In a review of the works before us the question of interpolation confronts us on the very threshold. If no interpolated MS. is worth anything, the Perusine codex by which Scaliger set so much store need not detain us an instant. For it is undeniably interpolated. Was Mr. Palmer then acting unadvisedly when he determined to publish his collation of it? I hold that he was right in his decision, and that his edition is more valuable for exhibiting this collation. For, from what has been said above, it appears that even where an author is preserved in quite early MSS., we cannot be safe from interpolated readings. Or, reversing the form of the statement, we may say that MSS. of a period very much earlier than that of the Catullian and Propertian codices combine readings of an interpolated with others of a genuine character, with such strange intricacy as to make the task of estimating the exact value of any given reading a very difficult one. Now no MS. of Propertius has yet been found earlier than the XIVth century, though some have assigned a date before this to the Neapolitanus. I am not disposed to admit what Bährens has so confidently stated in his Catullus and elsewhere, that from 1400 onwards MSS. become untrustworthy. It was not till the middle of the XVth century that the Renaissance can be said to have been really dominant. Hence MSS. rediscovered in the XIVth century were copied with very little change till some way on into the XVth. It is so with Catullus; from Bährens' own Apparatus Criticus for Propertius, it would seem that it was so with Propertius also: for two of his four primary codices are, as dated by himself, not earlier than the first or second decade after 1400, and no one

who has observed the fluctuation of opinion on the dating of MSS. even in adepts of the greatest experience can feel a confident certainty that any assigned date (when not actually stated in the MS.) may not be wrong by at least fifteen or twenty years. It does not follow, therefore, from the late date of the Perusinus that it should be largely interpolated; for though written in 1467 it might be as *sincere* as the Datanus, the spelling of which is alone almost sufficient to prove that it had not been *doctored* by the scribes of the Renaissance. It is from internal evidence alone that we know that the Perusinus is interpolated and only a second-rate MS. Any one who wishes to test this may satisfy himself by comparing its readings with those of Bährens' four primary MSS. on the one hand and those marked as interpolated (ς). A specimen may be taken from Book III. El. I 19 is written in all the primary MSS. *Mollia Pegasides date uestro sarta poetae*, the fourth foot being composed of a spondaic dissyllable. The Perusinus (P) has *uestro date*, a rhythm more familiar to ears trained by Ovid, and of far commoner occurrence. Bährens, I think, is right in pointing out that the change is really due to transcribers who were intolerant of the rarer rhythm, and altered it to suit their fancy. Yet in this same elegy P retains unaltered in v. 22 *onus* as written in the same primary MSS., and has no trace of *honus*, the interpolated correction. Proceeding to El. second of the same book P has the correction *grata* in 15 instead of the original and sincere reading *cara*. In the third, if Mr. Palmer's collation is complete, it shows little sign of corrected readings, neither *cecini* (7) nor *lares* (11) nor *flare* (42), although *Victorisque moram fabii* in 9 is a new reading and perhaps a mere correction. In the fifth, on the other hand, P presents two readings which Bährens marks as interpolated, *inertem* (9) and *ab inferna rate* (14); and such beyond a doubt is the spelling *Quorne* (37). Yet in the same poem P gives what we may fairly call the most uncorrupt reading, that found also in two of Bährens' best MSS. (DV), of v. 24 *sparserit integras*, from which the Italians restored the probable emendation *sparserit et nigras*. These examples are enough to show what is the fact about the Perusinus. It is interpolated, even considerably; yet not so decidedly as to deprive of all value readings which are unique and which there is reason to believe genuine relics of antiquity. Take as an instance II 33, 12, where, addressing Io metamorphosed into a cow, Propertius says, according to Bährens' best MSS., *Mansisti stabulis abdita pasta tuis*. Here instead of *abdita* P has *abbita*,



whence Mr. Palmer, rightly, in my opinion, restores *arbila* (*arbuta*), altering *Mansisti* to *Mandisti*.

This leads me to a doubt which concerns the whole question of MS. authority. It is true that in constituting the text of an author it is of the first moment to determine what are the sources with which the copyists have not tampered, the sources which present the ancient, and where an archetype can be traced, the archetypal tradition in its most unaltered shape. This is the point which Lachmann seized with such clearness, and which he carried out in his editions of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and even more rigorously in his Lucretius. And this is the point on which Bährens lays so much stress in his editions of the Roman *Erotici*. But it is a fact notwithstanding that readings not found in these first-class MSS., readings, too, which from their character cannot be suspected as modern corrections, are not unfrequently far nearer the truth than those of MSS. which as a whole are much more reliable. There is one of these, in my judgment, in the second book of Propertius (El. III 22). The line is given in all the best MSS. thus: *Carmina que quivis non putat aequa suis*. Following this reading Scaliger emended, *Carminaque aequaevis*; Mr. Palmer, *Carmina quae quaevis*; Bährens, *Carminaque a uiuis*. Compare these with the old and long received emendation of Volscus *Carminaque Erinnēs*. Can any one doubt which is the most probable? Yet *Erinnēs* was based not on the reading of those cardinal MSS., but on the word *lyrnēs*, which occurs in a MS. now held of secondary importance, the Groninganus. To me this *lyrnēs* or *lyrines* (as it is written in the margin of one of Bährens' MSS.) has a stamp of genuineness which, whatever the ultimate verdict passed on the value of the Groninganus, leaves little doubt as to the goodness of the emendation. I cannot accept as in the least degree plausible the explanation suggested by Bährens and adopted by Mr. Palmer, that the word is a gloss on *lyricae*. And I confess my decided distrust of the Bährensian method of summarily dismissing as worthless all MSS. which do not belong to the first class. Between such a MS. as the Groninganus or the Perusinus and the interpolated MSS. of the worst kind (they are usually written elaborately on parchment and got up in a splendid style) there are many steps; to treat them as all equally worthless is a grave error, and a much worse error in authors which at the best do not go back beyond the XIVth century.

But it is time to give some account of the position which Bährens

claims to occupy among editors of Propertius. It is uncertain when the poems were brought to light. But in the middle of the XIVth century we know that Petrarch possessed a MS. of them, and it was about the same time that two copies of the archetype seem to have been made. Two families of MSS. stem from these; the first represented by A, a codex written about 1360, once in the possession of Voss and employed by Burmann for his edition, and F, in the Laurentian library at Florence, written toward the beginning of the XVth century, and bearing a note which states it to have belonged to Colluccio Salutato. Unfortunately A, the earlier and better MS., is imperfect, extending only to II 1, 63. The second family is represented by V, a Vatican MS. of the end of saec. XIV, once in the possession of the Jesuit College in Rome, and D, a Netherland codex written about 1410-1420, and employed like A by Burmann, who quotes various readings from it. These excerpts alone were known, it would seem, to Lachmann, who pronounced the MS. on their showing a poor one, a verdict which Bährens emphatically denounces: 'est enim hic unus ex optimis codicibus Propertianis dignusque qui tandem suo reddatur honori' (Proleg. p. vii). From these four MSS., AF, DV, and from these alone the archetypal reading is to be restored: all the other MSS. examined by Bährens he considers to be more or less interpolated, including, as I have above remarked, even the Neapolitanus (N). As Propertian controversy is pretty sure to turn on the estimate formed of this celebrated codex, I will abridge what Bährens says of it (pp. vii, viii). N is a parchment codex, in octavo form, containing on seventy-one leaves the Elegies. It has no inscription at the beginning or where a new book or poem commences, the change to a fresh poem being marked merely by the initial letter. The most widely diverse views have been held as to its age: Lachmann and Hertzberg assigned it to the XIIIth, Keil to the XIIth or XIIIth century. L. Müller believes it to be written in the XVth, and this is the view of Bährens, who considers it not earlier than 1430, partly from the character of the paper, partly from the style of the writing, which combines letters of an antique cast with others of a more modern type: a point in which it resembles other MSS. of lower Italy, which present a similar admixture of old and new. It may indeed have been written at Naples, as on the last page the name *Manetti* would seem to point to the famous Neapolitan of that name. It was examined in the XVIIth century by Heinsius, who gave it the name by which it has ever since been known. It

is derived from the family AF, but its text does not represent these exclusively, but contains also readings found in the other family DV, and has besides given admission to many corrections of the Italian scholars, wherever these seemed unusually plausible. Thus many variants found in the margin or by the side of the actual text of F and V are found in the text of N. In some particular verses the copyist of N has introduced a wholly new reading, whether of his own or derived from some now unknown source is doubtful. The MS. is so decidedly interpolated that Bährens justifies the exhibition of all its readings only on the ground that a comparison of them with those of AFDV will be the best way of exhibiting the difference between good and interpolated MSS.

Mr. Palmer, whose book appeared three months after that of Bährens, combats this view (pp. lxiii, lxiv), though far more briefly than might be wished. He points to five passages in which N alone seems to preserve the outlines of the true reading, and to two others (IV 4, 55, II 32, 22), in which what we may believe to be the very words of Propertius are to be found in N only; and he remarks that the orthography, which bears a decided stamp of antiquity, does not seem *introduced*, as Bährens holds, but handed down from an early and uncorrupted source. It seems worth while to examine this question a little more minutely, especially as most students are so entirely ignorant of MSS. as to be utterly at the mercy of an editor of whose insight they feel sufficiently assured to be indifferent to his erroneous or rash assertions. And in this case the discussion is really unavoidable; for, if N is interpolated, then not only Lachmann, Hertzberg, Haupt, three of the greatest names in modern Latin philology, but Heinsius, a scholar of the widest knowledge of MSS. and with a sense of Augustan nicety far beyond most editors, are wrong.

1. Readings found in N, not in AFDV, which, on internal grounds, *cannot have been introduced* by an interpolator.

III 5, 6:

Nec miser aere paro clade Corinte tua.

For *aere* AFDV have *ire*, for *clade* DV have *classe*, F *pace*.

The accepted and doubtless right reading of this line, which seems to date from the XVth century (we may remark in passing that the new editor is not explicit enough in his statements as to the gradual formation of readings), is *Nec miser aera paro clade, Corinthe, tua*. N's *aere* alone preserves the traces of this, at the same time that it shows the way in which the rest of the line was

gradually corrupted. *Aere* once changed to *ire*, *clade* was changed to *classe*. Here then N is only removed by one step from the truth, DV have advanced far beyond it towards error.

II 23, 22:

Me iuuerint nolim furta pudica tori. N.

DFV: *Me capiant.*

On this B. remarks '*iuuerint* N *interpolate*.' How can this be demonstrable, or even likely? If it was an interpolation of the XVth century, why admit a false quantity? Surely it is in every way more probable that it was a second reading of equal authority with *capiant*, perhaps even the cause of *iuerint*. Originally it was written *iuerint*, in process of time was corrupted (as in Cat. 66, 18) into *iuuerint*, and gave way to what seemed a more correct reading. Mr. Palmer, we see, admits it into his text.

II 24, 17:

Hoc erit in primis quod me gaudere iubebas? N.

FDV: *erat.*

*Erat* is obviously right, *erit* wrong. If the scribe of N introduced corrections, as B. thinks, into the text he was copying, how strange that he should not have done so here. I prefer to believe that he copied the MS. before him *as he found it*, mistakes, and palpable mistakes, not excepted. Such *mistakes* are—

III 1, 23:

Fame post obitum fingit maiora uetustae. N.

FDV: *omnia p. obitum — uetustas.*

III 5, 7, *frangenti* N for *fingenti*; II 33, 19, *humo* N, *Iuno* FDV, and perhaps II 30, 19, *Non tamen inmerito* for *Nunc tu dura paras* of DV. The words *Non tamen inmerito* occur again in III 19, 27, whence they seem to have been transferred to II 30, 19, by an error of some copyist. Here again B. says '*N interpolate*'; which to say the least is to *assume* the very point in dispute.

Another specimen of a variant found in N alone, not in FDV, is in IV 1, 31, *Soloni* for *coloni*. I believe this to be right; but whether right or wrong, the whole balance of probability is on the side of N against the other MSS. *Luceresque Soloni* (the Solonian Luceres, a piece of learned antiquarianism quite in keeping with the character of this book of Propertius) might very easily be altered to *coloni*; it is difficult, if not impossible, to believe the reverse.

III 15, 32:

Eurus sub aduerso desinit ire notho. N.

*Eurus in aduersos — notos.*

FDV.



Most editors agree in accepting Lachmann's emendation *Eurus ubi adverso* — *noto*, on this reading of N alone. If this is right, we have here a very indubitable instance of the goodness of N, which has preserved under the corruption *sub* the traces of the truth, wholly obliterated in FDV, B.'s uninterpolated MSS.

2. Readings found in N alone, not in (A)FDV, which it is easier to explain as descending from an earlier MS. than as corrections of the XVth century.

I begin with a crucial instance.

II 33, 37:

Cum tua praependent demissae in pocula sertae. N.  
FDV: demissa sertae.

The feminine form *sertae* is expressly mentioned by Charisius, and the line of Propertius quoted in illustration. It is also found in an anonymous grammatical treatise printed in the Vth Vol. of Keil's *Grammatici Latini*. B. accordingly has this note '*sertae Charisius et ex hoc interpolatus N.*' That is to say, the scribe of N was learned enough to have read either one of the very rare MSS. of Charisius (at the time B. supposes N written, still, it would seem, undiscovered), or the grammatical treatise *de dubiis nominibus*, or at least some other collection of Charisian excerpts. How strange that so erudite a man should not have been equally careful to correct the very doubtful word *tendisti* which all the MSS. give in III 8, 37. For Priscian, who quotes the passage with *nexisti*, existed in hundreds of copies, and cannot have been unknown to any one capable of correcting MSS., which, on the Bährenian hypothesis, we must assume. For my own part I cannot but think such assumptions dangerous and unsatisfactory. And in the present instance B. is setting up a theory in direct antagonism to the great scholars who preceded him; for this feminine *sertae* is adduced by Haupt as one of the clearest vouchers for the independent value of N.

II 9, 21:

Quin etiam multo duxistis pocula risu. N.  
duxisti. FDV.

The sudden change from the singular *potuisti* in which Cynthia is addressed, to the plural *duxistis*, in which she and her new lover are mentioned together, is thoroughly Propertian, and has been generally admitted as true. B. alone prefers *duxisti*. I say nothing of the probabilities of *interpretation* on either side; but it is very unlikely that a copyist would have *introduced* the plural

*de suo*, and if he did not, it is reasonable to refer it to an earlier MS. In the same elegy N alone has preserved in v. 26 the right reading *poterentur*, against the *potarentur* of F and *peterentur* of DV. Why should we suppose this a correction? For here we have not even the plea of an agreement in FDV to make such a supposition *ex hypothesi* necessary. Or take v. 12, *Propositum fluviis in Simoenta uadis*, as read in FN, against *Appositum* in DV. Both readings are possible, neither looks like a correction. But if one is a correction of the other, which of which?—a remark which, we believe, must have occurred often to those who have studied B.'s critical apparatus. If any correction *was* introduced by N's copyist, it would surely have been of *fluuiis*, which can hardly be right. Yet *fluuiis* remains intact in all the four MSS. NFDV.

III 11, 13, 14:

Ausa ferox ab equo quondam oppugnare sagittis  
Iniectis Danaum Penthesilea rates.

So FDV. For *Iniectis* N has *Meotis*, which is also written by a second hand in the margin of F. B. restores *Iniectis*, which *may* certainly be right. But so also may *M(a)eotis*, which has long been the accepted reading. Is *Meotis* then a correction? or is it another and a more exact rendering of a word written obscurely?

II 25, 41, 42:

Vidistis pleno teneram candore puellam  
Vidistis fusco, ducit uterque color.

So N: *dulcis* for *ducit* FDV, which B. accordingly restores to his text. Editors are likely here to be differently minded as to their choice; with B. I lean to *dulcis* as less commonplace than *ducit*. But neither is in any true sense a *correction* of the other; and the last thing which we have a right to infer from finding *ducit* in N alone is that N is interpolated, DFV sincere.

II 26, 43, 44:

Certe isdem nudi pariter iactabimur oris:  
Me licet unda ferat, te modo terra tegat.

So N rightly: FDV have *te quoque*, which is without meaning. The two words can hardly have been confused, and here again the most reasonable hypothesis is that *modo* descended to N from some source which was either not known to the scribes of the other MSS. or passed by in favor of the other reading.

II 32, 33, 34:

Ipsa Venus fertur corrupta libidine Martis  
Nec minus in caelo semper honesta fuit.

So N: instead of *fertur* DFV have *quamvis*. Here the case is more doubtful; *quamvis* does not accord with *Nec*, and *fertur* might seem to have been introduced to make the construction legitimate. Yet it is in support of the genuineness of *fertur* that the following distich, and that not a new sentence, but a clause appended to vv. 33, 34, begins with *Quamvis*, an iteration which Propertius would hardly have allowed, and which would supply a reason for *quamvis* making its way into v. 33.

Mr. Palmer says, rightly, 'Cur ab optimo libro *subito* desciscam non video.' It is indeed only too palpable that the determination to make his theory good on all possible occasions has dominated Bährens in cases where an unbiassed judgment would probably have led him to a different verdict.

III 24, 6:

Ut quod non esses, esse putaret amor. N.  
*esset* DV, *essem* F, *saepe* for *esse* FDV.

I would ask any one with the least acquaintance with MS. corruptions whether they have any doubt as to the fact here. N is clearly the one conservator of the true reading; FDV conspire in what is as evidently a gradual accretion of error. If B. ventures to maintain that this erroneous *esset saepe* has been *altered* by the copyist of N into *esses esse*, he is bound to prove it by something more convincing than the mere agreement of his four primary MSS. in the wrong against N alone in the right. To ascribe to a copyist of the early XVth century a felicity of correction worthy of a Bentley or a Lachmann is a somewhat dangerous experiment. That Propertius wrote *esses, esse* is as certain as anything in Propertian criticism; that this is found in a MS. *ex hypothesi* written about 1430, whereas four *ex hypothesi* earlier MSS. agree in an agglomerated falsity (for such is *esset saepe*), would lead any sane critic, not to the conclusion that the one MS. which presents the truth was corrected, but that it was drawn from an originally independent more trustworthy source. This single instance is, in my opinion, enough to prove B.'s view of the value of N wrong, enough to make us cautious in accepting his whole theory of the relation of the Propertian MSS. to each other, too much to permit uninquiring acquiescence in his judgment of the age of N, however carefully it may have been formed.

3. I will now mention together a number of cases in which N presents the right reading against AFDV, but in which the hypothesis of a corrector is conceivable, though not likely to be true.

They are, as might be expected, single words: IV 2, 19 *Mendax fama nocēs* N, *uoces* F, *uaces* DV; IV 2, 26 *secta* N, *facta* FDV; III 18, 20 *gemmea* FN, *semina* DV; II 33, 4 *Inacis* N, *Inacus* FDV, which seems exactly comparable with *Thessalis* in I 19, 10, the reading of DV against *Thessalus* NF; II 7, 3 *Ni nos diuideret* N, *Quis nos* FDV; II 8, 15 *Ec quando ne* N, *Et quando ne* DV; II 9, 25 *poterentur* N, *peterentur* DV, *potarentur* F; II 12, 8 *non ullis* N, *non nullis* FDV; II 15, 27 *sint* N, *sunt* DVF; II 15, 49 *dum lucet* N, *dum licet* FDV (I cannot accept L. Müller's hypothesis that *dum lucet* is a Christian reminiscence, at any rate it is very like Catullus); II 18, 22 *Huic* N, *Nunc* FDV; II 19, 20 *monere* N, *mouere* FDV; II 20, 8 *lacrymas* N, *lacrymans* FDV; II 22, 6 *incinit* N, *inicit* DV; II 25, 45 *sit* N, *sic* FDV; II 29, 11 *at* N, *et* FDV; II 30, 18 *palladis* N, *pallidus* FDV, *tumor* N, *timor* FDV; II 32, 22 *meretur* N, *mereris* FDV; II 33, 3 *pereant* N, *pereat* FDV; II 34, 25 *seros* N, *sacros* FDV; III 3, 32 *gorgoneo* N, *gorgonico* FDV; III 13, 3 *et* N, *est* FDV, 47 *At* N, *Et* FDV, 51 *limina* N, *lumina* FDV, 53 *diras* N, *duras* FDV (the exact reverse is found in III 23, 20, where N has *diras* wrongly, FDV rightly *duras*), 58 *nusquam* N, *nunquam* FDV; III 16, 3 *cadit* N, *cadet* FV, *cadent* D; III 17, 21 *fulmine* N, *flumine* FDV; III 15, 19 *papillis* N, *capillis* FDV; III 16, 34 *sic* N, *si* FDV; III 24, 28 *ire* N, *esse* FDV; IV 5, 5 *docta* N, *nocte* DV, *nocto* F, 24 *sectaque* NV, *sextaque* DF, 38 *quidlibet* N, *quilibet* DFV; IV 7, 8 *Eosdem* N, *Hosdem* FDV (this is a very telling instance, for in the line before N like FDV has *hosdem*, and it is inconceivable that a corrector who altered the one would not also alter the other); IV 7, 81 *anio* N, *hamo* FDV, 84 *uector* N, *uictor* FDV, 93 *nunc* N, *nec* FDV; IV 8, 11 *corripit* N, *colligit* FDV, 21 *spectaculum* N, *spectandum* FDV, 34 *nouare* N, *notare* FDV, 36 *utrique* N, *uterque* FDV m. pr., 56 *spectaculum* N, *spectandum* FDV; IV 9, 27 *limina uitae* N, *lumina uitae* (uitae F) FDV, 54 *limina* N, *lumina* FDV; IV 10, 37 *tolumni* N, *columni* DV m. pr.; IV 11, 81 *sint* N, *sunt* FDV.

4. My fourth argument in support of the sincerity of N is from the orthography. It preserves in a number of words the more right spelling, several times against the doctrine of the scholars of the XVth century. Thus *ei* not *hei* (the interjection) I 3, 38, IV 1, 58, IV 8, 48; *nequiquam* II 4, 15, III 17, 23; *pelice* not *pellice* III 22, 35; *temptare* I 3, 15, II 12, 19, II 3, 19, IV 7, 57, I 4, 25; *Parnasus* III 13, 54; *querellae* IV 8, 79; *umeris* IV 10, 11; II, 47; *murra* I 2, 3.



In other cases it preserves an archaic spelling, *Clytemestrae* II 19, 19, perhaps *onaerare* for *onerare* III 9, 26, *oportuna* IV 2, 21. But these traces of antiquity are crossed, as is always the case with MSS. so far removed from the time of the Roman empire, with the barbaric and erroneous spellings of the middle ages. See L. Müller, p. xv of the preface to his Propertius; and it is only to some small degree that it can be dwelt upon as an argument in support of N against other MSS. To sum up in brief what I have here been enlarging upon: The conclusion at which I have arrived is that N is *not* an interpolated MS.; that it stands on a level, as regards sincerity, with Bährens' four primary codices; that the same arguments which are used to prove it interpolated might be turned against a variety of readings in these four MSS.; that, as a corollary to this, the archetype which Bährens would reconstitute from these four is only partially to be accepted.

R. ELLIS.

## II.—A PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF PARTS IN THE PARODOS OF THE *VESPAE*.

The Parodos of Aristophanes' *Vespae* has already given rise to not a little discussion, and indeed the scenic difficulties and problems which it presents can hardly fail, upon close scrutiny, to become evident. Dr. Arnoldt, in his treatise of nearly two hundred pages (*Die Chorpartien bei Aristophanes, scenisch erläutert*, Leipzig, 1873), has entered into a detailed discussion of the passage. As, however, his whole work is one of general interest on account of important modifications which his results entail upon our understanding of Greek comedy, and as it is to take exception to some of these results in detail that the proposed redistribution is here offered, it may be best to review in outline his work for the benefit of any to whom it may be at present inaccessible.

In cap. I he treats of the chorus where it is divided up among the individual choreutae, viz., with a certain portion assigned to each member of the chorus, and consisting neither of an ode sung by them all collectively nor of half-choruses. This he claims is to be looked for especially in the Parodos, but names (p. 5) as exceptions *Nubes*, *Ranae* and *Thesmophoriazusae*. The others (with the exception of the *Plutus*) he takes up in detail, and includes a passage in the *Thesmophoriazusae* (vv. 655-727) as one among several examples of this assignment of parts to the individual choreutae taking place elsewhere than in the Parodos. The general theory is not new with Dr. Arnoldt, and he acknowledges his indebtedness to Bamberger (*De Carminibus Aeschyleis a partibus Chori cantatis*, 1832), Hermann and others who had done the same thing for Aeschylus; and in particular he discusses Hermann's application to Aristophanes himself in his treatise "*De Choro Vespae Aristophanis*, Lipsiae, 1843."

The general truth of this theory as applied to Aristophanes, Arnoldt seems to have established conclusively. The proofs lie partly in the matter, partly in the metrical form of the choruses. The most obvious indicia of change from one member of the chorus to another are (vid. Arn. p. 4): addresses; exhortations; demands and questions, all of which are directed by one member of the

chorus to some other member, often indeed addressing him by name; the use of the dual number; the frequent repetition of the same thoughts; and, finally, abrupt changes and oppositions in thought. As a good illustration of the necessity of assuming in certain passages one speaker and one only, Pax v. 496 may be quoted, where it is surely absurd to imagine the chorus tugging away at the rope and giving vent *collectively* to the sentiment *ὡς κακόντοι τινές εἰσιν ἐν ἡμῖν*, and again, in v. 499, *ἀλλ' εἴς' οἱ κωλύουσιν*.

In cap. II Arnoldt treats specifically of the functions of the Coryphaeus as concerned with the actors, and gives a valuable table of all the choral passages in Aristophanes, which are here in point, classed according to two main groups: 1. Where the Coryphaeus speaks alone, for the chorus, with the actors. 2. Where the chorus itself first speaks as a unit and then the Coryphaeus condenses and repeats its thought; thus observing, in the transmission of the same to the actors, the law that one individual only may speak with one actor alone.

In cap. III the Parabasis is discussed; also other choral odes, and the peculiar Parachoregemata and Parascenia.

In cap. IV he considers the chorus alone, and finally, in cap. V, the position of the chorus in Parodos, Epeisodion, Stasimon and Parabasis respectively.

An investigation so comprehensive and yet so detailed as is this of Arnoldt's cannot fail to be of great importance for all subsequent investigations in this field, and it seems probable that much of his work will firmly hold its own. It would scarcely be surprising, however, if in certain minor matters something remained to be said, and his application in the case of the *Vespae* seems unsatisfactory, even from a superficial examination, while a closer inspection renders desirable, if not imperative, a redistribution of details. The whole passage which enters into the discussion is *Vespae* vv. 230-487. The following is Arnoldt's arrangement by which the individual parts succeed one another *κατὰ στοίχους*, according to the external shape of the chorus.

I. Six choreutae (viz. at v. 230, 233, 235, 240, 242 and 246 respectively), or the first *στοῖχος* in the Iambic tetram., vv. 230-247.

II. Six choreutae (viz. at 249, 251, 258, 259, 262, 266 respectively), or the second *στοῖχος* in the syncopated catalectic Iambic tetram., vv. 248-272.

III. Six choreutae (viz. at 273, 278, 281, 282, 286, 290), or the third *στοῖχος* in the Dactylo-epitrites, vv. 273-290.





Philocleon has been shut up by his son Bdelycleon, with the hope of overcoming the former's unseemly lust for acting as dicast. In the chill of the early morning, before dawn, a chorus of old dicasts now enter (v. 230), picking their way through the muddy street by the dim light of lamps borne by some boys who attend them. As they enter they discourse *individually* upon past exploits, speak of Philocleon, the weather, the muddy streets, and of the suit which is to come before them that day. This is answered, presently (v. 317), by a wailing ode from Philocleon, who, unable to get out to them, calls upon Zeus for deliverance. Two by-plays, however, are included (vv. 247-257 and vv. 290-317) in the above, i. e. between the boys who are carrying the lamps and members or a member of the chorus. Finally, v. 332 sqq., the Coryphaeus and chorus engage in sympathetic dialogue with Philocleon.

Now, to Arnoldt's distribution of parts the following objections may be made:—

1. As regards the sense. In the by-play (vv. 247-257) between the chorus and the link-boys he assumes that each one of the three boys takes part in the conversation and a corresponding number of the choreutae likewise. The passage in question commences with a boy breaking in suddenly upon the tetrameter Iambics with a halting 'versus asynartetus.' That it is a continuous conversation between one boy and one member of the chorus seems evident upon inspection (Vespae, vv. 247-257):—

- Boy.* τὸν πηλὸν, ὦ πάτερ πάτερ, τουτονὶ φύλαξαι.  
*Chorus.* κάρφους χαμᾶθ' ἐν νυν λαβὼν τὸν λόχον προβύσων.  
*Boy.* οὐχ, ἀλλὰ τῷδ' ἐμοὶ δοκῶ τὸν λόχον προβύσειν.  
*Chorus.* τί δὴ μαθὼν τῷ δακτύλῳ τὴν θρυαλλίδ' ὠθεῖς,  
καὶ ταῦτα τοῦδ' αἰὸς σπανίζοντος, ὠνόητε;  
οὐ γὰρ δάκνει σ', ὅταν δέῃ τίμιον πρίασθαι.  
*Boy.* εἰ νῆ Δι' αὐθις κονδύλοις νοουθετήσεθ' ἡμᾶς,  
ἀποσβέσαντες τοὺς λόχους ἄπιμεν οἷκαδ' αὐτοί·  
κᾶπειτ' ἴσως ἐν τῷ σκότῳ τουτουὶ στερηθεῖς  
τὸν πηλὸν ὥσπερ ἀτταγᾶς τυρβάσεις βαδίζων.

Even more certainly spoken by one choreutes and one boy is the second by-play (vv. 290-316):—

- Boy.* ἐθελήσεις τί μοι οὖν, ὦ πάτερ, ἣν σοῦ τι δεηθῶ;  
*Chorus.* πάντ' ὦ παιδίον. ἀλλ' εἰπέ τί βούλει με πρίασθαι  
καλόν; οἴμαι δέ σ' ἔρεῖν ἀστραγάλους δῆπουθεν, ὦ παῖ.

- Boy.* μὰ Δί, ἀλλ' ἰσχάδας, ὦ παππία· ἦδιον γάρ.  
*Chorus.* οὐκ ἄν,  
 μὰ Δί, εἰ χρέμαιοσθέ γ' ὁμεῖς.  
*Boy.* μὰ Δί οὐ τάρᾳ προπέμψω σε τὸ λοιπόν.  
*Chorus.* ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦδ' ἐμε τοῦ μισθαρίου 300  
 τρίτον αὐτὸν ἔχειν ἄλφειτα δεῖ καὶ ξύλα κῶψον.  
 σὺ δὲ σὺκά μ' αἰτεῖς.  
*Boy.* ἄγε νυν, ὦ πάτερ, ἦν μὴ τὸ δικαστήριον ἄρχων  
 καθίσῃ νῦν, πόθεν ὠνησόμεθ' ἄριστον; ἔχεις ἐλ-  
 πίδα χρηστήν τινα νῶν ἢ πόρον ὧς Ἑλλας ἱρὸν εἰπεῖν;  
*Chorus.* ἀπαπαῖ, φεῦ, ἀπαπαῖ, φεῦ, μὰ Δί, οὐκ ἔγωγε νῶν οἷδ' 310  
 ὁπόθεν γε δεῖπνον ἔσται.  
*Boy.* τί με δῆτ', ὦ μελέα μῆτερ ἔτικτες,  
 ἦν ἔμοι πράγματα βόσκειν παρέχῃς;  
*Chorus.* ἀνόνητον ἄρ' ὦ θυλάκιόν σ' εἶχον ἄγαλμα  
*Boy.* ἔ, ἔ· πάρα νῶν στενάζειν.

A common-sense interpretation of the passage just quoted points to a continuous conversation between one boy and one member of the chorus. How could, for example, v. 310 be put into the mouth of any one else than the 'father' before appealed to? This one member of the chorus, it is natural to assume, was the Coryphaeus.

2. A second reason for a redistribution of parts is, that in Arnoldt's arrangement certain turns of expression are ignored which in accordance with his own principles should involve a change of speaker. Thus he regards the particle *ἀλλά*, when used not simply adversatively, but to introduce a new idea, as one of the most obvious indicia of a new part. In v. 244, however, where it breaks in abruptly upon a screed about Kleon, he ignores it and likewise the expressions v. 270 *ἀλλά μοι δοκεῖ* and v. 268 *οὐ μὴν*. The other proposed insertions of new parts, while they are not so obvious, are neither forced nor without analogy in Arnoldt's own divisions. If we introduce, at v. 237, a new choreutes at the words *καὶ τα περιπατοῦντε νόκτωρ*, we are simply supposing that No. 3 has turned from No. 2 on his left and addresses the words, from the middle of v. 235 on, to his neighbor on the right, who immediately chimes in and gives some specific details of their past exploits. Or if it seems preferable to introduce a new speaker at v. 241, he is there merely adding a new detail, as would be natural enough in the vivid style of conversation represented. The same

may be said of the introduction of the two choreutae at v. 263 and v. 264 respectively. As a parallel for the transition made by the simple particle *δέ*, Arnoldt's own introduction of new speakers in Equites v. 253 and Acharnenses v. 219 and v. 302 may be cited. It must be admitted, of course, that it may sometimes be questionable just where the division is to be made, but when once it is granted that there are twenty-four parts to be assigned, the few which do not assign themselves must be disposed of according to individual judgment.

There remain two more proposed insertions, viz., at v. 277 καὶ τὰχ' ἂν βουβωνιφῇ and v. 285 ἔστι γὰρ τοιοῦτος ἀνὴρ. If now the formal construction of this whole part (vv. 273-290) be considered, it will be seen that these additional choreutae introduced at the end of the first and third quarters, correspond to the speakers of the line, ὅπαγ' ὦ παῖ, ὅπαγε, which is to be read at the end of the part and also in the middle, at v. 280, where Arnoldt shows it has probably dropped out. In addition to this improvement in balance and equalizing in amount, the sense is benefited by the proposed arrangement, a new choreutes offering in the one case a fresh suggestion, and in the other a confirmation of the foregoing words of his neighbor, which are peculiarly in keeping with the tone of the whole. And, finally, as an accidental confirmation it may be mentioned that Hermann's original distribution assigned eight choreutae to these lines.

3. Arnoldt's order of succession is objectionable. For (a), in the first place, the choreutes who at v. 251 cuffs a link-boy would, in accordance with his assignment of parts, occupy an inside position (No. 7 in Fig.) where he could not reach the boys, who are supposed by Arnoldt to have walked on in front of the whole chorus. The only way in which it would be easy to conceive of a boy being near the choreutes in question, would be to suppose the boys to have been scattered through the ranks; but on this supposition it were hard to see how the episode would preserve any unity or animation if first No. 8 (according to Arnoldt's division) addressed a boy in front of him, and then No. 9 (who in the *κατὰ στοιχοῦς* arrangement would be behind No. 8) addressed a boy behind the third row, and so on. But by the arrangement suggested the three boys are in a position properly to light the chorus, the by-play is brought directly in view of the spectators, and since the whole part is assigned to No. 9, the Coryphaeus, and to the boy beside him, all mechanical obstructions disappear.

The mechanical objections are even stronger in the second by-play (vv. 291-316) where Arnoldt makes the boys hold a conversation with nine several choreutae scattered all along two files—a conversation which, as above indicated, does not make very good sense unless as a dialogue between two only. We might use here almost the very words of Arnoldt where, objecting to Richter's assignment of the conversation, Pax v. 114 sqq., to more than one of the daughters of Trygaeus, he says (p. 168): "an dem Gespräch mit Trygaeos nur eine und dieselbe Person sich betheiligte und in ihm als Wortführer für die übrigen fungirte. . . . jede neue Frage der Tochter fusst auf der letzten Antwort des Vaters."

(b) Again, by the arrangement suggested, sub-dialogues between two or three members of the chorus fall to those who are walking side by side, and although the chorus is arranged externally *κατὰ στοιχούς*, this seems more effective and natural than that each should address the man behind him and that the conversation should leap over in each case from the back end of the one file to the front of the next.

(c) That the succession of parts should run along the files—i. e. first that next the *θεάτρον*, then the next, and so on—and the action thus pass further and further away from the spectators, seems less natural than that the *ranks* as they successively near the focus of interest should carry on the action.

This involves, however, the whole question of arrangement *κατὰ στοιχούς* and *κατὰ ζυγά*, and Arnoldt has laid it down (p. 29) as a law that to the one or the other of these two are the choruses to be referred, according as the natural demarcations in sense, metre, etc., partition them off into groups of sixes or fours respectively. Now in this is contained an important admission in favor of the proposed theory, for Arnoldt assumes that the order of succession in both cases was from one choreutes to the one behind and not *transversely*, even when the chorus was marching *κατὰ ζυγά*. This indicates that in his estimation the *external* shape of the chorus had no necessary connection with the succession of the parts, which is all that is needed negatively. But as a positive confirmation of the possibility of the transverse order, we may quote the example from the Ecclesiastusae, which, as he says (p. 99) himself, consisted of three *ζυγά* of choreutae, one in the Pro-ode (vv. 478-482), one in the Strophe (483-492), and one in the Antistrophe (493-503), each containing four persons. So that the metre here forces us to accept the transverse order of succession. Likewise in the passage in the



Lysistrata, v. 352 sqq., he changes to the transverse order. At least it is clear that there was nothing in the nature of things to prevent this arrangement from being the one adopted in the *Vespae* provided that the natural demarcations of metre are observed. In the case of the *Acharnenses* (v. 204 sqq.) it may be questioned whether he has not been over-hasty in assuming his groups of fours, as the clumsy device of making the first four choreutae speak twice in succession and the ignoring of breaks like *ἀλλὰ μοι μηνύσατε* (v. 206) and *διωχτέος δέ* (v. 221) point to the necessity of re-arrangement. Possibly vv. 280-284 may have come round to the Coryphaeus, who would then occupy very much the same position that Lucian (*Piscator* I), in his humorous imitation of this passage, causes Socrates to assume. Arnoldt's most cogent proof of the succession by file is the *Parodos* of the *Aves*, where he finds confirmation in the circumstance that the names of the birds are mentioned in sixes by *Euelpides* and *Peithetaerus*. But even in the face of this the mechanical difficulties seem greater than in the transverse order, and *ὀπίσθεν* (v. 299) could have been said just as well of No. 5 in reference to his position in the second row behind No. 4.

4. Upon the four-fold division of the chorus in the *Episodion* (vv. 334-434) Arnoldt relies as strongly confirming the four-fold division of the *Parodos*. But if the strictures made above upon the conversation between the boys and the chorus be found cogent, Arnoldt's arrangement in the *Parodos* would fall of itself, and, furthermore, this four-fold division in the second case is confirmatory of the proposed redistribution into three parts, and in particular of the transverse succession. For the chorus having now faced round towards *Bdelycleon's* house, each *στοῖχος* becomes a *ζυγόν*, so that the chorus would now be naturally divided into four transverse sections of six each.

5. Finally, the proposed arrangement brings the centre of interest back again to the Coryphaeus, catching up, as it were, the loose ends of the *Parodos* and binding it together into one whole before the fresh turn given, v. 317, by *Philocleon*.

In conclusion, then, it may be claimed that the proposed change, while undoubtedly open to some objections, offers advantages of a two-fold nature:—

1. An improvement in sense in particular passages.
2. A more natural arrangement for the chorus, both collectively and individually.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.

### III.—IMPERFECT AND PLUPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE IN THE ROMAN FOLK-SPEECH.

Of the classical form of the Latin Imperfect Subjunctive the Romance languages, even in their oldest monuments, afford no trace whatever. Did this form exist in the unwritten speech of the common people of the old Roman world? The language of Romance grammarians—even of those who, like Diez, accept fully the theory of the derivation of the Romance languages from the popular and not the literary Roman tongue—implies that it did; for they speak of its absence from the modern languages as a “disappearance,”<sup>1</sup> and say that it disappeared on account of the inconvenience arising from its resemblance to certain other tenses: thus *amarem*, through a careless pronunciation of the vowel *e* of the termination, might have been misunderstood by the person addressed for the abridged form of the Pluperfect Indicative (*amaram*), or of the Future Perfect Indicative (*amaro*), or of the Perfect Subjunctive (*amarim*); people therefore ceased to say *amarem* and used instead the Pluperfect form *amassem*.

Other forms of the Latin verb, however, which present the same liability to confusion, are found in the Romance languages; as the Imperfect and Future Indicative of *esse* in Old French and Provençal, and in all the conjugations two of these very tenses in question—the Pluperfect and Future Perfect Indicative, transformed into the First Conditional and Future Subjunctive—in Spanish and Portuguese.

In the verbs of the Romance strong conjugation, moreover, the difference in the forms of the Imperfect Subjunctive and of the other tenses above mentioned is so unmistakable that there could have been no possibility of confusion, while the difference in accent would have prevented error in such verbs of the weak conjugation as do not accent the penult in the Imperfect Subjunctive: there could be no confounding, for example, of *facerem* with *feceram*, *fecero* or *fecerim*; of *arderem* with *arseram*, *arsero* or *arserim*; of *haberem* with *habueram*, *habuero* or *habuerim*; nor of *venderem* with

<sup>1</sup> Diez, Gram. der Rom. Sprachen, II 118.

*vendideram, vendidero or vendiderim.* If the literary form of the Imperfect Subjunctive had existed in the popular Roman language at the time when the Romance languages were in process of formation, it might easily and would naturally have been preserved, so far at least as to leave some slight traces. Instead, therefore, of speaking of its non-appearance in the modern languages as a disappearance, it is reasonable to suppose, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that it was not generally used in the folk-speech of the Roman world.

In contrast, or rather in correspondence, with the total absence from the Romance languages of the classical form of the Imperfect Subjunctive, is the existence in them all of the Latin Pluperfect Subjunctive, and its use, in all except Wallachian, to represent the meaning of the Imperfect Tense (e. g. Latin Pluperfect *amassem*, French Imperfect *j'aimasse*), while the modern languages express the Pluperfect Tense by the Latin Perfect Participle Passive combined with the Pluperfect Subjunctive of *habere* or some other auxiliary (Latin *habuissem amatum*, French *j'eusse aimé*). The correlated conclusion to be drawn from this fact is that in the popular Roman language the classical form of the Pluperfect was commonly used, as it is in the modern languages, in the sense of the Imperfect. In no other way can we account for the existence of this phenomenon throughout the whole Romance domain with a single exception. That an exception should be presented in Wallachian—where indeed the form of the classical Pluperfect Subjunctive is also preserved, but with its meaning changed to Pluperfect Indicative instead of Imperfect Subjunctive—does not destroy nor seriously affect the force of the argument; for the earliest literary remains of that branch of the language extend no further back than the end of the XVth century, before which time there was ample opportunity, under the corrupting influences to which the Roman speech was there exposed, for the production of this and the many other divergencies from the characteristics of the sister languages which are found in the North-East.

While the classical Latin that has come down to us furnishes no example of the substitution of the Pluperfect for the Imperfect Tense, further proof that such a usage prevailed in the Roman folk-speech is afforded by some of the Low-Latin texts of a date anterior to that of the oldest specimens of the modern languages. In these texts the Imperfect and Pluperfect Tenses are both found in the Imperfect sense, presenting an example of the curious way

in which the literary and popular idioms were mingled in the Low Latin. In some instances, where the context shows that the Imperfect force should be given in the case of both verbs alike, the two forms are found in the same sentence with only the conjunction *et* or *aut* between them; as—

Ut non *fecissemus* et *inquietaremus* (Esp. sagr. XIX 339);

Nulla persona ad vicem sua direxit qui ipso placito *custodisset* aut sonia nonciare *deberit* (Form. Andeg. XIV).

Other examples of this substitution in Low Latin are given by Diez, Gram. der Rom. Spr. III 330. It is possible that in the popular speech both the Imperfect and Pluperfect forms were similarly employed without discrimination, and that the Imperfect form was afterwards crowded out by the Pluperfect; but, as has already been said, the Romance languages, which are a truer indication of the old folk-speech than is the Low Latin, afford no evidence that such was the case.

Let us now inquire whether the Pluperfect Subjunctive of the classical Latin was used in the popular speech to express the Pluperfect as well as the Imperfect idea, thus doing double duty; or whether, as in the modern languages, the compound form and that only was employed for the Pluperfect. No doubt the compound form existed in the folk-language: this is established by the same proof as has been adduced above to show the use of the literary Pluperfect in the sense of the Imperfect, namely, its general adoption in the Romance languages, the one phenomenon being co-extensive with the other; and concurrent, though less conclusive, evidence is afforded by the somewhat similar application in classical Latin of the Perfect Participle Passive as secondary predicate with the Present, Imperfect and Perfect of *habeo*; as—

Fidem quam *habent spectatam* jam et diu *cognitam* (Cic. Div. in Caecil. IV).

Multis jam rebus perfidiam Haeduorum *perspectam habebat* (Caes. B. G. VII 54).

Verres deorum templis bellum semper *habuit indictum* (Cic. in Verr. V 72).

The compound form of the Pluperfect Subjunctive, as presented in the Romance languages, expresses the Pluperfect idea—at least from the classical point of view—in an exaggerated and emphatic manner; being not *haberem amatum*, *I might have loved*, as we should expect from the analogy of the classical examples and from the other compound Romance tenses, but *habuissem amatum*, *I*

*might have had loved.* This calls to mind the so-called super-compound tenses of modern French, which, discarded by the educated classes, are not uncommon in the speech of the people: *j'ai eu aimé, j'avais eu aimé, j'aurai eu aimé*, etc.

But there is reason to believe that the simple Pluperfect form of the classics also existed in the folk-language with the Pluperfect meaning. This may be inferred, first, from the persistence in Wallachian, even to the present day, of the Pluperfect sense, though with a transfer to the Indicative Mood; and, secondly, from the not infrequent appearance of this form as a Pluperfect as well as Imperfect Subjunctive in the early literature of the other Romance languages. Indeed, Huc Faidit, a Provençal grammarian of the XIIIth century, in his "*Donatus Provincialis*," gives this tense the name of Pluperfect. The following examples from the Italian, Provençal and Old French show how the Latin Pluperfect (Romance Imperfect) form was once used in these languages where the compound would now be required:

E se non *fosse* che da quel precincto,  
Piu che dall' altro, era la costa corta,  
Non so di lui, ma io sarei ben vinto.

(Dante, *Inf.* XXIV, 34-36.)

E certo il creder mio veniva intero,  
Se non *fosse* il gran Prete, a cui mal prenda,  
Che mi rimise nelle prime colpe. (*Inf.* XXVII, 70-72.)

La donna di sapere ebbe disio  
Chi *fosse* il negromanto, ed a che effetto  
*Edificasse* in quel luogo selvaggio  
La rocca.

(Ariosto, *Orl. Fur.* IV 28.)

E c'el no lan *crees*  
E deu fruit no *manjes*  
Ja no murira hom  
Chi ames nostre don.

(Prayer to the Virgin, XIth Century, Bartsch, *Chr. Prov.* 19, 5-9.)

Entre lo dol et l'ira et lo maltraire,  
Si no *fos* sa molher, no *visques* gaire.

(Gir. de Ros. 6639, 40.)

Quar s'el no *fos* faiditz et tant desers,  
Ja no *partis* de mal ne *fos* convers.

(Gir. de Ros. 6742, 3.)

Ki lui *veist* Sarrazins desmembrer,  
Un mort sur altre a la terre geter,  
De bon vassal li *pouist* remembrer.

(Chans. de Rol. 1971-3.)



Se *fust* armés, je cuit ne *fust* ocis.

(Garin le Loherain, 5610.)

La *veïssiez* mainte crois aportee.

(Amis et Amiles, 3179.)

Ichil qui la *fust* donc a chel assement

Et del pere et del fil *veïst* l'embranchement,

L'un l'autre regreter, seignour, tant douchement,

S'il *eüst jeüné* trois jours en un tenent,

Sachiés que de mengier ne li *presist* talent.

(Herman de Val., Bib. de Sap. 97-101.)

In this last citation while the simple forms (*fust*, *veïst*, *presist*) have the Pluperfect signification, the compound form (*eüst jeüné*) may have been introduced to indicate a period antecedent to that of the time expressed by the simple Pluperfect.

Similar to the use of the simple form of the Pluperfect Subjunctive in a Pluperfect sense, is the frequent employment in Spanish and Portuguese of the simple instead of the compound tense of the First Conditional, or, as it is sometimes called, First Imperfect Subjunctive,—this simple tense being in form the Latin Pluperfect Indicative,—thus:

Que *dijera* el señor Amadís si lo tal *oyera*? (Cervantes, Don Quix. II 7).

Se os antigos philosophos, que andaram

Tantas terras por ver segredos dellas,

As maravilhas, que eu passei, *passaram*,

Que grandes escripturas, que *deixaram*!

(Camões, Os Lus. V 23.)

I have noted, chiefly in Provençal and Old French, many other instances of the use of the simple instead of the compound form of the Pluperfect Subjunctive with a Pluperfect meaning. Of some of them it may perhaps be said that they are not Pluperfects but Imperfects, the Imperfect Tense being used exceptionally in conditional and potential clauses with respect to past time just as is sometimes the case in Latin. A few of the examples above given, for instance, are more or less analogous to the following from the Latin, and, regarded as Imperfects, might be explained in the same way:

Pecuniae an famae minus parceret, haud facile *discerneret* (Sall. Cat. XXV).

Si hoc optimum factu *judicaret*, unius usuram horae gladiatori isti ad vivendum non dedissem (Cic. in Cat. I, 12).

Si Protogenes Ialysum illum suum caeno oblitum *videret*, magnum, credo, *acciperet* dolorem (Cic. ad Att. I 21).

Inasmuch, however, as the instances of this usage in the older

Romance texts are so numerous as to make it the rule and not the exception, and as the peculiar shades of meaning conveyed by the Latin Imperfect referring to past time in conditional clauses do not apply to many of the Romance examples, it seems best to explain the latter in most cases as a persistence of the simple Pluperfect form of the Latin in a Pluperfect signification.

It would be interesting to compare the Romance languages with the classical Latin to see how far the common people of the old Roman world agreed with or differed from the literati in the use of the Subjunctive to express various shades of thought. Such a comparison would show a general resemblance between the two idioms, but some important divergencies. The Subjunctive would be found to have had a more restricted range in the popular than in the literary idiom, certain of its offices in the latter being supplied in the former by the corresponding tenses of the Indicative, and others by that compound of the Infinitive with the Imperfect or Perfect Indicative of *habere* of which scarcely an indication is discovered in the classical authors,<sup>1</sup> but which produced the so-called Conditional Mood of the Romance languages. This comparison, however, would take us far beyond the limits proposed for the present paper.

Of course any conclusions drawn from the Romance languages concerning the speech of the Roman common people can be asserted positively only for that later period of its existence during which the modern languages were in process of formation. There may be other evidence to show that at an earlier epoch there was a closer correspondence with the literary usage than is here indicated. The purpose of this paper has been merely to present the testimony of these languages concerning one feature of the idiom from which they were derived or, more correctly speaking, which they perpetuated. That testimony may be summed up as follows:

1. The classical form of the Imperfect Subjunctive probably did not exist among the common people, and its place was supplied by the Pluperfect form.

2. The Pluperfect idea was probably expressed sometimes by the simple Pluperfect Tense, and sometimes by a compound of the Past Participle with the Pluperfect Subjunctive of *habere* or some other auxiliary.

EDWARD ALLEN FAY.

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the nearest approach to it is found in Ovid, *Trist.* I 1, 123:

Plura quidem *mandare* tibi, si quaeris, *habebam*,  
Sed vereor tardae causa fuisse morae.

#### IV.—PROBLEMS OF GENERAL SEMITIC GRAMMAR.

A number of causes have combined to retard the study of the general grammar of the Semitic languages. Chief among these has been the real paucity of materials. The various dialects, especially those known up to thirty years ago, seemed so much alike in inflections and vocabulary as to offer little hope of fruitful comparison; it was felt that the phenomena approached too near to identity to allow a penetration behind the present stage of linguistic development into a markedly different one. And it has happened, besides, that during the present century Semitic scholars have been much occupied with working up new dialects, especially the Babylonian-Assyrian and the Sabeian. In general, as the workers in this department have for various reasons been relatively few, while the field is large, the greater part of the available force has been expended on more or less special investigations. To this it must be added that scientific methods have been comparatively slow in making their way into Semitic grammatical studies. Old Jewish grammatical traditions still linger in our text-books; the grammars of Arabic, Hebrew and the related languages have hardly yet reached the conception of an independent treatment of the phenomena with which they deal; their terminology and mode of treatment are largely derived from medieval Arabic writers who were disciples of the early Greek schools, and from the current Indo-European grammars. For these reasons there has been no attempt at a full comparative treatment of the grammatical facts of the Semitic family. Renan announced his intention to prepare a comparative grammar, but never carried it out. Ewald, Olshausen, Bickell, Philippi and others have made occasional and valuable contributions to the subject, but there has been no general connected presentation of the facts. It is a gain, however, that the necessity for such work is recognized, and that much preliminary work has been done and is being done. It is to be hoped that these preparatory investigations will rapidly increase in number, and the material gotten ready for the future historian of Semitic grammar. Meantime it may be of use to state briefly some of the morphological questions that require solution.

In the first place, passing over palaeographical questions (of which, however, there are many that need working up), we find in the phonology not a few points that have not received satisfactory examination. Unfortunately, all early Semitic writing, with the exception of the Assyrian, is without vowels, and as there are no very early transcriptions into languages provided with vowel-signs, a good deal of uncertainty rests on the pronunciation of all these languages down to a short time before the beginning of our era. The one example of an ancient vowel-system, the Assyrian, has the disadvantage of being taken from a foreign, non-Semitic language, and probably fails to give the nicer differences of the vowel-pronunciation. The elaborate schemes of the Ethiopic and Hebrew were made at a time when the pronunciation of these languages had already undergone considerable changes, and when, in the case of the latter, a somewhat artificial system of the schools had taken the place of the original. There are no transcriptions into Indo-European languages earlier than the proper names that are found in the Septuagint, and these are mostly made by translators who did not speak Hebrew as their vernacular. Such transliterations in ancient times are often, indeed, of little value; it was not usual to take more trouble than might be necessary to give the most convenient representation in one's native tongue of a foreign word. Even now, as is well known, transcriptions from one language into another are not often reliable. Still some help may be got from a careful comparison of such renderings as exist of Semitic words in foreign alphabets. What Renan undertook to do for Greek by an examination of Syriac translations of Greek words might profitably be attempted for Latin, Greek and other transliterations of Semitic words. In the absence of early vowel-signs we have to resort to the later systems (devised some centuries after the beginning of our era) and to general grammatical principles. No attempt has yet been made to determine the original vowel-sounds, to trace them through the changes they have undergone in the various dialects, and to define their etymological functions. In the decision of such questions some use may be made of the modern Semitic languages, especially Arabic; but the present pronunciation has to be treated with great care, since it is obvious that it is different from that of a thousand years ago, and it may be inferred that it is still more different from that of four thousand years ago. As to whether the vowels had symbolic significance, it does not appear that there are sufficient data for deciding such a question; but if ever any con-

clusion in respect to it is reached, it must be after their powers and uses have been settled.

The consonants offer several interesting points of inquiry. The sounds of some of them are not yet clearly determined. The group of sibilants, for example, is difficult; what is the relation of the *Sin* to the *Samek*, and what is the reason of its absence from the Syriac? Ethiopic has a curious *p*-sound, and Sabeian an equally curious *t*-sound, and modern Arabic presents some noteworthy fluctuations of usage, as in the sonant palatal, which is our *g* in Egypt, and our *j* elsewhere (and in some regions French *j*). There are traces also of the origination and dropping of sounds; sometimes it is a question whether one language has differentiated the original sound, or another has dropped one of two consonants, substituting for it one nearly related, as in the *Cheth* and *Ayin*, which have two forms each in Arabic, and only one in Hebrew. The early transliteration of Hebrew *Çade* by *st* raises a question as to its pronunciation. The interchanges of letters between different languages and within the same language require more careful statement than has hitherto been made of them. Of the former there are the interchanges between the dental and the sibilant, and between *Ayin* and *Çade* and others; of the latter, that between *m* and *w* in Assyrian, the change of *s* before *t* into *l* in the same dialect, and the Sabeian change of *m* to *b*. This is a point that is often very loosely handled. Some lexicographers allow themselves the greatest license in attempting to trace the connection between various stems of similar meanings. Perhaps Semitic etymology does not furnish materials for a Grimm's Law, but at least it should be settled which letters interchange and which do not.

Next, there is the standing problem of the triliteral roots, much discussed, but still unsolved. The difficulties connected with it are so great that some scholars are disposed to dismiss it as insoluble. But, though its treatment has often been unscientific and arbitrary in a way to bring discredit on the whole investigation, and though data for the determination of all the questions involved are not at hand, there is no reason to despair of progress. Something has been done towards clearing away misconceptions, and particularly in abandoning *a priori* assertions. Thus it has been said (and is still said) that polysyllabic original roots are inconceivable, or that it is impossible to conceive of anything else. But it is now generally believed that we know too little of primitive speech to say what was or was not possible; soberer feeling leads



us to refrain from pronouncing opinion on times whose conditions are not fully known to us, and to wait till examination of the facts shall carry us step by step to sure results. One thing may be considered as established, that the great mass of the Semitic primitive roots were triliteral; beyond this not much progress has been made. The essays of Friedrich Delitzsch and Philippi towards the decomposition of the triliterals into biliterals are admirable specimens of scientific work; but the results obtained by these and similar attempts are not wide and general and coherent enough to give assurance of their correctness. One thing that stands in the way of reliable and useful results is the fact that these attempts at the analysis of dissyllabic into monosyllabic roots are usually made for the purpose of comparing Semitic roots with Indo-European in order to prove the formal identity of the two families, and there is naturally undue haste in making the comparisons. The substitution of such an ulterior in the place of the purely scientific aim of discovering the facts beclouds the vision and vitiates the conclusions. For the present Semitic and Indo-European students must give up the attempt to show that the two families are identical in their word-material, and confine themselves to determining, as far as possible, the original forms and meanings of the roots. The immediate problem in the Semitic department is to look for traces of root determinatives, and as preliminary to this there should be a more careful lexicographical treatment of the various dialects. The decision of other, more general questions must depend in like manner on the accumulation and examination of the phenomena of primitive speech. It has been asked how the Semites came to adjust their radicals to this three-syllable measure. It is no answer to this question to say that they had a trisyllabic instinct, or a sense of euphonic fitness that required just this form; that is merely stating the phenomenon in different words. Nor does it help to point out the advantages of this system, to say, for example, that the consonant skeleton, filled out with vowels combined in a great variety of ways, gives symmetry to the language, or to define the inflectional and other functions of the two classes of letters, or to say that the developments of the consonant and vowel elements of words went hand in hand. All these things may be true, but they do not explain the triliteral form of the roots. On the other hand, if these be regarded as original and uncompounded, it has to be explained why this form remained in one family of languages and not in others. The question would then belong to the science of

language, and its decision would involve an examination of all the linguistic families in the world. Whether we proceed from this point of view or not, there are some groups of languages that the Semitic student must take into account, especially what has been called the Sub-Semitic, and the Egyptian, the grammatical treatment of which has not, however, been carried very far. These are most akin to the family with which we are dealing, and, though the time may not yet have come for a serious lexicographical comparison, it is probably to this point that we must look for light on the vexed question of the origin of the Semitic trilaterality.

When we come to the formation and inflection of stems there is less mistiness, though here also there are many questions awaiting solution. In the first place, it is generally agreed that noun and verb, in their present form, both come from an original noun-verb, which, as a simple uninflected stem, performed the functions of both. This appears from the fact that the inflections of noun and verb are in the main identical, the chief difference being in the forms of the personal pronouns that are attached to them. There is no difficulty in supposing a time when only nouns, or nouns and pronouns were used in speech; in classic Hebrew there are sentences without verbs, the verbal idea being expressed by the abstract noun of action (Infinitive), nouns also acting as prepositions and adverbs. The succeeding history of the language may then be regarded as a process of differentiation of this previously existing material. The noun developed itself in one direction, and the verb in another. The precise form of the original trilateral noun-verb is doubtful, whether it had only one vowel or a full trivocalism.

Passing now to the history of the development of the noun, we have first the formation of derivatives by prefixes and suffixes; to the former belong *t, s, m, n, y*, and to the latter *m, n, y, w*. The same letters occur in the two classes; is there any difference in their force before and after the stem? This question can be answered only by fixing the meanings of the affixes, which it is not easy to do. The significations are most of them very general. To two of the prefixes it may be possible to attach definite values, namely, to *m*, which denotes the place, instrument, agent or act, or, in general, the place, and *y*, which expresses the agent or, more generally, the category. The first of these has, as suffix, a very general attributive sense; it is, perhaps, nothing more than the determinative attached to the noun, which will be mentioned further on. The suffix *y* is equally general in meaning, signifying 'be-

longing in the category of.' Is *n* the noun-determinative? and are *w* and *y* to be connected with the case-endings *u* and *i*? From the simple noun-forms in which the *t* occurs as prefix it would appear to signify first the action (as in the abstract noun of action or Infinitive in Arabic), and then the result of the action, and sometimes, perhaps, simple attribution, as in *tirosh*, 'new wine,' literally 'shining,' from a stem meaning 'to be bright.' Possibly *t* is found as suffix, distinct from the feminine-ending, in Ethiopic, in the ending *ot*; but if so, it has a general attributive sense. The *s* is found only as prefix, and then apparently as connected with the derived stem known as Shaphel. Are these formative letters to be referred to original nouns or pronouns? Those who regard the sentence as the primitive unit of speech would explain them as originally meaningless elements of the polysyllabic unit to which significations were in process of time attached; but even in that case it is necessary to determine the oldest assignable signification of the suffix, no matter what its origin may have been. The question as to the nature and origin of these formative letters will be answered differently by different persons according to their conception of the nature and origin of the pronoun, and will not be settled till this second question is determined.

Next come the noun-inflections proper, the feminine, the cases, the determinative syllables and the plural. It is a question whether these are to be considered as identical with or different from the formatives above-mentioned. It would be in accordance with analogy, and would greatly simplify the treatment to regard all developments of the stem as derivatives. But this is a different thing from regarding the similar formative additions as identical in signification and origin, and the proof of this it is difficult to furnish. There are two feminine endings, *t* and *i*, which resemble in form the suffixes and prefixes above-mentioned, but it is not easy to see any resemblance in the meaning. It would be necessary to assume a very general attributive meaning for the ending, and suppose that this had in some way unknown to us been assigned to the expression of the feminine. This is certainly possible, and it cannot be said to be improbable. On the other hand, two endings originally very different in form and meaning, may in time have come to assume the same form. It would be a pleasing generalization to bring all the formative uses of the letter *t* under one original, but it would be arbitrary and precarious. The immediate question as to the feminine ending is whether it had originally a

nominal or a pronominal signification, to which no satisfying answer has yet been given. For the feminine *i* it must first be determined whether this or *ya* was its earlier form, and the conclusion on this point will probably go along with that reached in relation to the case endings. If we may judge from the present form of the noun, the feminine was the earliest modification of the uninflected stem, after which came the designations of case, now existing under the forms *u*, *i*, *a* for the singular, *ā*, *ī* for the plural, and *ā*, *ai* for the dual. The explanations of these forms at present proposed fall into the two classes mentioned above: those that regard them as originally meaningless and gradually invested with a numerical signification, and those that look on them as from the first significant agglutinations, either nominal or pronominal. For the purposes of etymological investigation, however, the difference between these two is not important, since in either case the object is to determine the earliest assignable form and meaning of the termination, and these are independent of the theory of origin. All who have written on the subject agree that the endings in the three numbers are composed of the same elements, and it is only necessary as the first step towards the solution of the problem of origin to determine what original form will satisfy all the conditions of the terminations as they now exist. Was the form *u*, *i*, *a*, or *wa*, *ya*, *ha*, or something different from both these schemes? According to the first the plurals and duals are made from the singulars by an extension of the vowels, sometimes by a simple vowel-broadening (*u* into *ā*, etc.), sometimes by the insertion of *i* or *y* (as in the dual). This insertion is somewhat arbitrarily assumed, and the second scheme seeks to meet this difficulty by supposing a symmetrical agglutination of the three syllables, *wa*, *ya*, *ha*, which under certain phonetic conditions are retained, under others become *u*, *i*, *a*, or, by doubling, *ā*, *ī*, *ā*. They are thus brought into connection with the formative endings *w* and *y*, as in nouns ending in the singular in *āt* (or *ōt*), *īt* and *ait*, which are regarded as being for *ha. ha. t*, *ya. ya. t* and *wa. wa. t*—a somewhat cumbrous set of forms. Both these schemes furnish more or less satisfactory explanations of a part of the facts, and neither explains all. For the meanings of the endings, *u* or *wa* and the others, nothing beyond a general demonstrative sense, 'this' or 'that,' has been suggested. The internal plurals, which are confined to southern dialects, are properly derived nouns, but the derivation is effected by peculiar means, and constitutes a charac-



teristic of these dialects. The same principle is carried out to some extent in the formation of derived verb-stems, but far more elaborately in the noun. The singular and plural forms sometimes change places, and it seems most probable that the internal or broken plurals are only nouns used as collectives and therefore naturally as plurals. The external plural of the feminine in *at* resembles these in so far as it is made by broadening the vowel *before* the feminine sign *t*, after which come the case endings of the singular. It is doubtful, however, whether this fact favors the view that the ordinary plural case-endings are formed by broadening the vowels of those of the singular. It is merely a grouping of a number of objects of the feminine gender into a single mass and regarding them as a unit, as happens, for example, in the Greek use of a singular verb with a neuter plural subject. The ending *at* is, however, sometimes explained as coming from *a(t)*. *at*. After the case-ending the Semitic noun takes a determinative letter or syllable, which indicates sometimes a definite, sometimes an indefinite state. The form is commonly *m* or *ma* (mimation), or *n* or *na* (nunation), but in one dialect, the Sabeian, *han* also occurs; this last would most naturally be regarded as a compound of *ha* and *na*, the second element being the nunation, and the first connecting itself with the Aramaic *a*, the sign of the emphatic state (which is by some, however, regarded as the accusative ending). On phonological grounds the *m* is generally regarded as older than the *n*, but this is uncertain. The fact that the same dialect (as the Assyrian) uses *m* in the singular and *n* in the plural shows that the two existed side by side. This proves nothing as to chronological priority, but may indicate that both the endings were found in the primitive Semitic language. These determinatives have sometimes been brought into connection with the adjective or formative endings *m* and *n*, but without any satisfactory result. As to their origin the classes of opinions are the same as in similar forms above-mentioned: they are regarded as differentiations of meaningless endings, or as significant appendages, nominal or demonstrative.

This last difference of opinion recurs in the discussion of the pronouns themselves, which are held by some to have originally had the pronominal sense, by others to have been nouns on which a demonstrative sense was grafted. This question is not likely to be soon settled. In the case of one word, the Hebrew relative pronoun *asher*, a nominal origin has been made probable; but for the simple forms common to all the Semitic languages, whose origin



goes back to a remoter antiquity, it is not likely that any such derivations could be discovered, if they had taken place. In this discussion, however, no weight can be attached to *a priori* assertions, as, for example, that the nature of the pronoun is so different from that of the noun that it could not have had a nominal origin. The form of the stems or roots is plain, except in the case of the personal pronouns. In these it is commonly supposed that the syllable *an* enters as a component (in the third person in Jewish Aramaic), leaving easily recognizable stems except in the first person, of which the original may have been in the singular *an-a-ki* (or *an-a-ku*), and in the plural *an-ah-na* (modern Egyptian Arabic *ah-na*, modern Syriac *ah-nan*, *ah-ni*); here the stem left, after omitting the *an*, seems to be *ak* or *ka* or *ki*, or the variants *ah* or *ha*. Another form, *ti*, occurs as personal affix of the verb in the Perfect singular, and the same co-existence of *t*- and *k*- forms is found in the second person. This has been explained as an interchange of *k* and *t* or (what amounts to nearly the same thing) an assimilation of one to the other, or as the co-existence of two independent stems, or a compound stem combining the two is assumed, of which one part or the other is supposed to be selected by the different dialects, or in the same dialect to be assigned to different uses. The simplest supposition is that of interchange, though it is not without difficulties. There is yet another form of the first person which occurs as suffix in Assyrian, Arabic and Ethiopic, namely, *ya*, of which no explanation has been offered, except a suggestion that it may be a phonetic extension of the *i* found in *anoki*. In the third person we have for the masculine and feminine of the singular respectively *su*, *si* (Assyrian) or *hu*, *hi* (Hebrew) or *tu*, *ti* (Ethiopic); Arabic shows the longer forms *hu-wa*, *hi-ya*, and Ethiopic *we-e-tu*, *ye-e-ti*. The *s*- form is commonly regarded as the original. The *wa* and *ya* are brought into connection with the supposed case-endings above-mentioned, whereby, however, the vowels of *hu* and *hi* remain unexplained; for if they be regarded as identical with the case-endings of the noun, which arise from *wa* and *ya*, then the presence of these syllables in *hu-wa* and *hi-ya* seems superfluous. Whether the *u* and *i* originally marked a difference of gender is doubtful; the vowel-difference is not always found in the plural, the objective feminine sometimes has the form *hd*, and in early Hebrew *hu* is used for both genders. The plural in the second and third persons is now marked by the addition of *m* or *n*; usually the former is employed for the masculine and the

latter for the feminine, but in Assyrian *n* occurs in both genders, the distinction being made by the vowel (*u* for the masculine, *i* for the feminine, as in the singular); the dual (in Arabic) has *m* in both genders. These endings are usually compared with the mimation and nunation in nouns; and it is to be noted that Arabic, which employs only the *n* in nouns, has *m* in the plural and dual masculine of the pronoun, while Assyrian, which has *m* in the singular of the noun, shows only *n* in the pronoun—whence it may be inferred, as suggested above, that both letters existed as determinatives in the primitive language. It has been attempted to find distinctions of case in the personal pronouns, for example, in the different forms used as suffixes to verbs and to nouns in the first and second persons, the former being supposed to represent the subject and the latter the object; but it seems clear that they are merely different fragments of the pronominal stem expressing the same relation of the person to the nominal or verbal stem; there is no case-difference between *malak-ta* and *malke-ka*, the pronouns in both mean "in respect to thee," and usage alone has fixed the present difference in the sense. The striking similarity between the Semitic personal pronouns and the Egyptian is by some regarded as an accidental coincidence, by others as the result of borrowing by one language from the other, and by others as the indication of the original unity of the two; it is a point that needs further investigation.

In the verb the first question relates to the form and tone of the simple stem, and the origin of the derived stems. It is generally agreed that the original simple stem was trivocalic; not much attention has been paid to the tone; the facts of later tone-usage in the various dialects seem to favor the view that the accent was originally on the first syllable. It may be assumed of the derived stems, as of the simple, that they are nouns, and formed according to the laws of noun-derivation, without deciding whether their origination was prior or posterior to the full elaboration of the verbal conception. Their ultimate elements are few and simple, though the combinations in the various dialects are numerous and complicated, and their origin difficult of explanation. They may be reduced to two classes: 1. Those made by modifications of the existing material, as by doubling a radical or a syllable of the simple stem, by broadening a vowel, or by inserting a weak consonant, as *w*, *y*, *n*; 2. Those made by the addition of new material, as by prefixing or inserting *sa*, *ha* (*a*), *ta* or *na*. The first class expresses

an intensifying or directing, or some similar modification of the meaning of the simple stem, the second adds a substantive idea, usually causative or reflexive; there is apparently a symbolism in the modes of formation. The same questions here arise, and the same sorts of explanation are given as have already been mentioned in the case of the noun. Are the prefixes and infixes nominal or pronominal? That the original significations were very general may perhaps be inferred from the fact that they sometimes interchange: the reduplicated form, usually intensive, is sometimes causal, and the *ta* is sometimes reflexive and sometimes causal. Or, this may result from a coalescence of originally distinct forms. What has determined the prefixing or insertion of these formative syllables? and can they be brought into connection with those of the noun? A more general question is that of the reasons for the choice of their particular form of verb-development (which is found in other languages also); but this goes outside of the domain of etymology. Of the two verb-forms, the Perfect and the Imperfect, the former is generally held to be a concrete noun with personal pronouns attached, except in the third person, which is a bare noun, the plural being formed regularly. The Imperfect also is a concrete noun, made from the simple stem by the prefix *ya* (mentioned above), the three cases in *u*, *i* and *a*, the last also with *n* added, being made the bases of separate forms which have been differentiated into various syntactical uses. It is noteworthy that all the dialects, whether they employ *m* or *n* as the determinative of the noun, have *n* in this form of the verb; similar phenomena have been referred to above. The chief difficulty in the Imperfect is found in the prefixes, especially those of the second and first persons. Are they pronouns, or are they forms that preceded the differentiation of the pronoun? If the other persons are formed on the third, what has become of the *y*? and if not, what is the nature of the prefixes? if they are pronouns, why are they prefixed? and if they are not pronouns, whence come the personal significations? These are some of the questions that have to be answered.

C. H. TOV.

## V.—NOTES ON THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS.

The following observations occurred in a course of lectures on the *Oresteia*, which I had the pleasure of giving at Oxford last Summer Term; and although I cannot hope that they will in every case be new to the readers of the *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY*, yet I trust that they may be found neither so trite nor so ill-founded as to be wholly unacceptable.

1. The fact that Aeschylus nowhere mentions Mycenae has been remarked by many scholars,—amongst others by Bishop Wordsworth in his book on Greece, and more recently by Professor Mahaffy. It has been usual to connect it with the suppression of Mycenae by the Argives in B. C. 468, which is mentioned by Plutarch. It is certainly curious, as Mr. Mahaffy has pointed out, that an event of such importance should not be noticed by Thucydides. But his account of the period in question is confessedly a mere fragmentary sketch, and the importance of the event is rather a reason for supposing the tradition which records it to be genuine. However this may be, we recognize in Eum. 762-774 clear evidence of the desire of Athens to conciliate Argos, and the exclusive prominence attached to that city by Aeschylus may reasonably be associated with this desire.

But without dwelling on political motives, it is interesting to observe that throughout the *Oresteia*, Aeschylus assumes a conception of the circumstances of "the tale of Pelops' line," which differs in many particulars from that which may be roughly spoken of as common to Homer and Sophocles.

This is only one of many examples of the truth, that in the age of Tragedy, and indeed long afterwards, the outlines of legendary history in Greece were scarcely less indefinite than those of mythology.

In Homer and Sophocles, Agamemnon is King of Mycenae, while his brother Menelaus reigns at Sparta. In the *Oresteia*, on the other hand, it is manifestly presupposed that up to the time of the departure of the fleet for Troy, the two sons of Atreus had jointly exercised at Argos the regal power whose fountainhead was in the palace of the Pelopidae. Their empire was less extensive than that attributed to King Pelasgus in the Supplices, for Phocis

was beyond its boundaries. But the whole of the Peloponnesus was included in it, and Sparta is regarded as non-existent. The return of Menelaus no less than of Agamemnon is looked for by the Argives, as that of their own beloved king, *τῆς δὲ γῆς φίλον κράτος*.<sup>1</sup> Paris, in visiting Menelaus, had come to the house of the Atridae;<sup>2</sup> and from thence had Helen stolen forth, leaving to her fellow-citizens<sup>3</sup> (i. e. to the Argives) the burdensome task of levying war. And while the kings are thus imagined as sharing the same palace,—where in peaceful times we may imagine them as sitting in judgment on the “dread thrones” before the gate,—the site of the palace is not at Mycenae but at Argos. This is proved not only by the omission of the name Mycenae, but by the fact (which travellers testify) that the beacon on M. Arachnaeus would not have been visible from Mycenae, whereas from Argos it would, and also, although this is less significant, from several passages which indicate the nearness of the city to the shore.<sup>4</sup>

Leaving on one side the political tendency which has been above inferred from the Eumenides, and on which it is easy to lay too much stress, we may observe how much this way of conceiving the fable has contributed to the artistic unity and concentration of the trilogy, and still more of the Agamemnon as a single drama, in which the antecedent circumstances have necessarily such an important place.

At the opening we find Clytemnestra in sole possession of the vast palace. First Helen had gone, then Menelaus and Agamemnon with him, and the other daughter of Tyndareus alone was left. She has sent away her son Orestes, and keeps her daughters (and Hermione if she is thought of) in abject subjection, together with the servants of the house. There, amidst the horror-breathing silences she remains alone, completely possessed with the one thought,—the one constant resolve,—to take condign vengeance for her child. That this, and not her attachment to Aegisthus, which came subsequently, nor her jealousy of Chryseis or Cassandra, is her prime motive in the idea of Aeschylus, appears not only from her own words, which may be suspected of hypocrisy, but from those of Calchas, which are repeated with so much emphasis in the first choral ode, *μῖμνει γὰρ φοβερὰ παλίνορσος οἰκονόμος δολία, μνάμων μῆνις τεχνόποινος*.

Although alone in the palace, Clytemnestra is not alone in her desire of revenge. Aegisthus has long since returned from exile,

<sup>1</sup> Ag. 619.<sup>2</sup> Ag. 400.<sup>3</sup> Ag. 402.<sup>4</sup> Ag. 46, 493, 690, 1.



but while restored to his fatherland is still an exile from the house of the Pelopidae. He is bound in honor to be avenged for his father Thyestes, and his brothers whom Atreus had massacred.

During Agamemnon's stay at Troy these two hatreds had coalesced in one: Clytemnestra, brooding on vengeance and reckless of all else; Aegisthus, likewise loving revenge, but not insensible to the charms of the kingdom and the queen. Still, although suspicion is rife at least within the palace, there has been no overt act of crime, either in the way of adultery or of usurpation. Aegisthus is still assumed to be a stranger to the palace, and no one has ventured openly to question the chastity of the wife of Agamemnon. This occurs for the first time at l. 1625 (see below) after the death of the king. Thus not only the immediate antecedents of Orestes' matricide, but all the antecedents without exception, the Thyestean banquet, the rape of Helen, the departure of both kings, the sending away of Iphigenia for sacrifice, revolve round one local centre, the Argive palace of the Pelopidae. The separation of Menelaus and his ships from the returning fleet is also more pertinent to the action than if he had been bound for Lacedaemon. For the King of Men in his hour of danger is thus deprived of the natural succor which the presence of his brother and yoke-fellow in the kingdom would have afforded, according to the Greek proverb, *Ἀδελφὸς ἀνδρὶ παρείη*. If the destination of Menelaus had been Lacedaemon and not Argos, the effect of this would be entirely lost.

## II.

Having premised so much as to the general scope of the Agamemnon, I proceed to consider some points in the interpretation of particular passages.

Ll. 70, 71.

*ἀπύρων ἱερῶν  
ὄργας ἀτενεῖς παραθέλλει.*

Since the old explanation of these words, which assumed that the Furies were worshipped without burnt-sacrifice, was rightly discarded on comparing Eum. 108, 9, *καὶ νυκτίσεμνα θεῖπν' ἐπ' ἐσχάρῃ πυρὸς | ἔθουον*, subsequent interpreters have contented themselves with supposing "sacrifice to which no fire was put" to be a figurative expression for sins of omission generally, or for all sin. But was the scholiast wrong after all in supposing that the words contain some allusion to the Erinyes, and so continue the thought of l. 59?<sup>1</sup> How if we imagine the sacrifice, not as one offered to the

<sup>1</sup> *πέμπει παραβάσιν Ἐρινίην.*

Erinyes, but as one of which they are the ministers,—and of which the sinner is the victim? That such a notion was not foreign to the mind of Aeschylus appears from the language of the Erinyes themselves in threatening Orestes. See esp. Eum. 305 καὶ ζῶν με δαίσεις οὐδὲ πρὸς βωμῷ σφαγείς. The only question is whether the words of the present passage will bear this meaning: "the unrelenting Wrath attending on the rite which employs no fire": i. e. the anger of the Furies, who in pursuing their victim have no need of "material fire," since they are able to consume him with their breath,—νηδύος πυρί, Eum. For *ἱερά*, meaning a sacrificial rite, see Hdt. i, 172; 2, 63.

2. L. 55. μαλακαῖς ἀδόλοισι παρηγορίαις.

*ἀδόλοισι* means "without guile," i. e. incapable of deceiving, because the unguent would not have been drawn from its repository in the palace except by the arrival of authentic news. Its consolatory intimations were thus sealed with the authority of the sovereign.

3. Ll. 105-7. ἔτι γὰρ θεόθεν καταπνέει

† πειθῶ μολπᾶν

ἀλλὰν ξύμφυτος αἰὼν.

Neglecting for the moment the two words *πειθῶ μολπᾶν*, the remainder of the sentence admits of being construed thus: "The life that was born with me still breathes down valor from on high." The *αἰὼν*, equally with the *ψυχὴ* and the *δαίμων*, is continually spoken of as separable from the person to whom it belongs. But the word *ἀλλὰν* alone would be vague and inappropriate, and requires some further definition. This is supplied by the two words which we have so far neglected, if for *πειθῶ* we read *πειθοῖ*, as an instrumental dative.

ἔτι γὰρ θεόθεν καταπνέει

† πειθοῖ μολπᾶν

ἀλλὰν ξύμφυτος αἰὼν,

"Through persuasive song the genius of my life still breathes valor on me from above,"—i. e. Although my bodily strength declines, the Muse is with me still.

4. Ll. 140-4. τόσσον περ εὐφρων ἂ καλὰ

δρόσοισι λεπτοῖς μαλερῶν λεόντων,

πάντων τ' ἀγρονόμων φιλομάστοις

θηρῶν ὀβριχάλοισι

τερπνὰ τούτων

† αἰτεῖ ξύμβολα χρᾶναι.

The difficulty of this passage turns upon the obvious defect of logic which there is in saying "Artemis is angry for the hare, but although so tenderly disposed to all wild creatures, yet she *demand*s a glad fulfilment of the sign. Only I pray Apollo she may not send a storm." These last words show that *τερπνά* means "a fulfilment pleasant for the Greeks," i. e. the sacking of Troy. And what the logic of the place requires is not that Artemis should *demand* this, but that she should not directly oppose it. If by the change of a single letter for *αἰτεῖ* we read *αἰνεῖ*, this requirement is fulfilled:

*τερπνά τούτων*

\* *αἰνεῖ ξύμβολα χρᾶναι,*

"She yields assent to the fulfilment of the glad counterpart of this sign."

5. Ll. 196, 7. *παλιμμήκη χρόνον τιθεῖσαι*  
*τρίβω.*

May not this mean, "Redoubling the effect of delay through wear and tear"? Cp. l. 391, 2, *τρίβω τε καὶ προσβολαῖς | μελαμπαγῆς πέλει.*

6. L. 201. *ἄλλο μῆχαρ.*

This is commonly so explained as to imply that other remedies had been tried and failed; which is of course possible. But according to a familiar idiom it is also possible that *ἄλλο* may simply emphasize the contrast between the evil and the cure for the evil, "A remedy more unendurable *even* than the cruel storm."

7. L. 224. *παρακοπὰ πρωτοπήμων.*

This is understood to mean "the infatuation which is the first step in a long train of sorrows." But may it not mean "the infatuation which comes of the first plunge into sorrow"?

8. Ll. 249-52. *δίχα δὲ τοῖς μὲν παθοῦσι μαθεῖν*  
*ἐπιρρέπει*  
*τὸ μέλλον τὸ δὲ προκλύειν*  
† *ἐπιγένοιτ' ἂν κλύοις προχαιρέτω.*

Although the words *τὸ δὲ προκλύειν* are not by the first hand, they seem to be genuine, and the conjunction *θ'*, in l. 241 indicates the loss of a participle such as *προσορωμένα* (O. C. 244), which would restore the correspondence of metre. And the occurrence of the glyconic rhythm in the middle of the strophe is rendered probable by its appearing again at the close in ll. 246, 257. If so much is granted, the corruption in the last line may be removed by inserting *εἰ* before *κλύοις* in an emphatic sense, nearly equivalent to *καί*.

Δίκα δὲ τοῖς μὲν παθοῦσιν μαθεῖν ἐπιρρέπει  
τὸ μέλλον· τὸ δὲ προκλύειν,  
\* ἐπεὶ γένοιτ' ἂν, \* εἰ κλύοις, προχαίρετω.

"A righteous dispensation orders that men shall know the future only through the constraint of suffering it. But as to listening for it beforehand, farewell at once to that, since (even) if you do hear it,<sup>1</sup> it will come to pass." Cp. Suppl. 1047, *ὅ τί τοι μόρσιμόν ἐστιν, τὸ γένοιτ' ἂν*.

9. L. 276. *τις ἄπτερος φάτις*.

"Some settled word,"—i. e. "A rumor which infixes itself in the mind," and does not take to itself wings like a dream. Cp. the Homeric *τῇ δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο μῦθος*, and *infr.* 425, 6,

βέβακεν ὄφρις οὐ μεθύστερον  
\* πτεροῦσ' \* ὀπαδοῦσ' ὕπνου κελεύθοις.

10. Ll. 286–9. *ὑπερτελής τε πόντον ὥστε νωτίσαι  
ἰσχυρὸς πορευτοῦ λαμπάδος † πρὸς ἡδονὴν  
πέυκη τὸ χρυσοφεγγές ὥς τις ἥλιος  
σέλας παραγγείλασα Μακίστου σχοπαῖς*.

The absence of a finite verb from these four lines is not satisfactorily defended by Hermann. The only question is where the lost word lies concealed. Professor Kennedy's *προῦκεῖτο* (for *πέυκη* τὸ) is liable to the objection that a verb of rest is ill-suited to the energy of the passage. Besides, *πέυκη* is eminently the right word in the right place. The beacon on Mount Athos would naturally be of pine-wood, as that on Messapius (l. 295) was of heather, and the new subject comes rightly, with a pause after it, at the begin-

<sup>1</sup> I am told that Professor Goodwin has written a learned exposition of this passage, which I have not yet had an opportunity of seeing. Meanwhile I send in my own suggestion for what it is worth. L. C.

Professor Goodwin's article was published in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1877, p. 72 seqq., in which he gives from his own collation the exact readings of the Medicean, Florentine and Farnese MSS. The words *τὸ δὲ προκλύειν* and the colon after *μέλλον* do not appear in the Farnese, and in the Medicean were added by a later hand in blacker ink. Professor Goodwin follows the Farnese MS., construes *τὸ μέλλον ἐπεὶ γένοιτ' ἂν κλύοις* as = *τὸ μέλλον κλύοις ἂν, ἐπεὶ γένοιτο*, citing Aristoph. Pac. 137 for the hyperbaton of *ἂν*, and pointing out the assimilation of *ἐπεὶ γένοιτο* from *ἐπειδὴν γένηται*. He does not accept Wellauer's *σύννορθρον αὐγαῖς*, but reads *σύννορθρον αὐταῖς* (cf. *ἀνορθος* and *ἐξορθος*), and refers *αὐταῖς* to the *τέχνην Κάλχαντος*, v. 248: *The future you can hear of when it comes; before that bid it farewell, and this is as well as to lament it beforehand; for [whatever we do] it will come out clear and plain in full accord with these (prophetic arts)*. B. L. G.

ning of a line. The hypothesis of a lost line or two, in which Pelion would be mentioned, is made improbable by the appropriateness of l. 286 to describe a longer leap than heretofore, and of the words *ὥς τις ἥλιος* to indicate a light appearing from the northeast. It follows that an early conjecture, *ισχὸν* for *ισχύς*, is to be adopted, and that the missing verb must lurk in the phrase *πρὸς ἡδονήν*, of which no satisfactory explanation has been given. The termination of an aorist or imperfect is at once obtained by changing *η* of the last syllable to *ε*, and the remaining letters suggest some compound of *πρὸς* or *πρὸ*, I conjecture *προήνυσεν*.

ὑπερτελής τε, πόντον ὥστε νωτίσαι,  
 \* *ισχὸν πορευτοῦ λαμπάδος* \* *προήνυσεν*  
*πέυχη, τὸ χρυσοφεγγές, ὥς τις ἥλιος,*  
*σέλας παραγγείλασα Μακίστου σκοπαῖς.*

"And (a beacon of) pine-wood mounting so as to glance over the sea, sped forward the might of the traveler's lamp, passing on, like a sun, with golden radiance, the fire-message to Macistus' peak."

11. L. 304. In favor of Casaubon's *μοι χαρίζεσθαι* it may be observed that as the description comes nearer home, it is natural for the queen to speak of the lighting of the signal fires as a personal service done by her neighbors to herself.

12. L. 314. *νικᾷ δ' ὁ πρῶτος καὶ τελευταῖος δραμών.*

"And victorious is he who ran from first to last." Clytemnestra is not explaining to the Argive elders the nature of the *λαμπαδηφορία*, which they know well, but is pointing out the difference between her own and the ordinary *λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι*. The victory in the common torch-race was distributed amongst several runners, who had successfully passed the torch from hand to hand. But in the present case Hephaestus was the sole runner and sole victor, and he was *victor* in no ordinary sense, for he ran victoriously with news of victory. Hence *νικᾷ*, carrying this double association, holds the emphatic place in the line.

13. L. 336. *ὥς δυσθαίμονες*—Sc. *ὄντες*, in the imperfect tense. "As men who had been tried with hardships."

14. L. 413. Without occupying space by a discussion of the various conjectures on this line, I will add one more suggestion:

*\*ΑΛΑΚΤΑ ΠΗΜΟΝΩΝ ΙΔΩΝ,*

"Having seen" (i. e. experienced) "an unforgettable sorrow."

<sup>1</sup> See an article by Wm. Morice in the Cambridge Journal of Philology.



15. Ll. 494, 5, et seq. μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι χάσις  
 πηλοῦ ξύνουρος, διψία κόνις, τᾶδε, κ. τ. λ.

Bishop Blomfield was, I believe, the first who suggested that these words applied not to a cloud of dust raised by the herald and his companions (cf. S. c. T. 81, 2, ib. 494), but to the dust and mud upon his clothes. It was perhaps natural that an English scholar should be reminded of Sir Walter Blount,

"Marked with the variation of each soil  
 Betwixt that Holmedon and this seat of ours,"

but it is strange that others should not have perceived the inappropriateness of such a remark as applied to the herald who is seen approaching from the neighboring shore (ἀπ' ἀκτῆς), where he has arrived by crossing the Aegean from Troy. The dust raised by his approach (perhaps not unaccompanied) at once shows his haste as the bringer of important tidings, and also proves that he is a real solid human being, and not a voiceless phantom or imponderable element, like the light which brought the earlier message. The speech clearly belongs to the Coryphaeus and not to Clytemnestra, who is obviously not present when ll. 546-50 are spoken.

16. L. 534. ἀρπαγῆς τε καὶ κλοπῆς δίκην.

The *theft* was proved by the disappearance of Helen; and when Paris refused to give her up, he showed himself to be not only a thief but a *robber*.

17. L. 612. χαλκοῦ βαφάς.

According to the old interpretation of these words, they were supposed to be equivalent to "the thing that is not." But when it was shown that "bronze-dippings" (according to Mr. Browning's quaint rendering) could not be thus described, a new line of explanation was pointed out by Hermann, who from the words in the Choephoroe (l. 1011), ὡς ἔβαψεν Αἰγίσθου ξίφος, inferred that χαλκοῦ βαφάς might be a figurative expression for "slaughter." And he imagines Clytemnestra to say in effect, "I am as innocent of adultery as I am of murder." But it is unlikely that in speaking to the chorus here she should have used figurative language, or made her illustration more obscure than her first expression. Here, if anywhere, we may expect the appearance of plain speaking. And the phrase is perfectly intelligible, if for "the thing that is not" we substitute "the thing that I know not." The tempering of metal was a mechanic process, known to a class of mean craftsmen, and to few or none beyond it,—a mystery of low-born men—

the last thing therefore which a delicately nurtured princess could be expected to know. It is much as if a modern fine lady were to say, "I could no more think of doing such things than of shoeing a horse."

18. Ll. 615, 6. μανθάνοντί σοι

*τοροῖσιν ἐρμηνεύειν.*

Are the "clear interpreters" the herald's ears?—i. e. you understand her meaning, if you hear her words.

19. L. 637. *χωρίς ἡ τιμὴ θεῶν.*

"The honor of the gods is to be kept apart," viz., from that of the Erinyes (*infr.* 645), who are spoken of as distinct from the gods in *Eum.* 197, 350, 361, 366, 386.

20. L. 767. *NEAPA ΦΑΘΥC CKOTON.*

In support of Ahrens' conjecture *δταν τὸ κύριον μόλη φάος τόκου*, it has not been sufficiently noticed that *NEAPA* as a corruption may easily be accounted for, especially with *νεδζουσαν* preceding, by supposing *HMEPA* to have existed as a gloss on *ΦΑΘC* and afterwards to have crept into the text.

21. L. 817. *χειρός*, the MS. reading, is preferable to *χεῖλος*, which implies that the vessel was all but full. *χειρός*, "from" or "by the hand," is introduced in opposition to *ἐλπίς*. "*Hope* alone came near to it: it was not *actually* replenished."

22. L. 864. *καὶ τὸν μὲν ἦκειν, κ. τ. λ.*

The paratactic structure of these words has led interpreters to miss the point of them. The meaning is, "No sooner had we announced his coming than another declared he was bringing home a worse evil than his death would have been." This covert allusion to Cassandra, who is standing beside the king, gives a natural indication of the bitterness which underlies the smooth hypocrisy of Clytemnestra's speech.

23. L. 871. Cp. S. c. T. 941, 2 (Paley).

*ὑπὸ δὲ σώματι γᾶς*

*πλοῦτος ἄβυσσος ἔσται.*

24. Ll. 933, 4. *K. ἡδῶ θεοῖς δείσας ἂν ὦδ' ἔρδειν τάδε.*

*A. εἴπερ τις. εἰδώς γ' εὖ τόδ' ἐξεῖπον \*τάχος.*

Cl. "You might have vowed to the gods in some moment of alarm that you would do this as I now propose that you should. Might you not?"

Ag. "I might, if any man ever did. Yes, I say this unhesitatingly, because I know it so well."

I agree with Dr. Kennedy (Camb. Journal of Philology) that the meaning of  $\eta\delta\zeta\omega \acute{\alpha}\nu$  is determined by the comparison of l. 963. But I cannot think that  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  is sound. The flaw, as it seems to me, lies here, and not in  $\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\nu$ . This, the aorist of the immediate past, may rightly refer to  $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\pi\epsilon\rho \tau\iota\varsigma$ , the words that have been just spoken. Agamemnon, after professing an unchangeable resolution, is surprised into sudden assent by Clytemnestra's subtly flattering reference to "the dangers he has passed." The words  $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\pi\epsilon\rho \tau\iota\varsigma$  having escaped him, in spite of himself, he adds by way of excuse that his near acquaintance with danger made him speak unhesitatingly ( $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\varsigma$ ),

25. Ll. 982-6.  $\chi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma \dots \sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ .

I cannot think that  $\chi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$  is the subject of  $\pi\alpha\rho\eta\beta\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ . Reading  $\chi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma \delta' \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$ , I would make  $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  the nominative to the verbs which follow. For the image of the army passing its prime cp. the words of Nicias in Thuc. 7, 14,  $\beta\rho\alpha\chi\epsilon\iota\alpha \acute{\alpha}\chi\mu\eta \pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ . The question remains whether the time referred to is the siege of Troy or the delay at Aulis. The latter has the advantage of restoring some clearness to a place which would be otherwise too obscure, by connecting the abiding presentiment which the Chorus here acknowledge with that of which the grounds were given in their first Ode (ll. 184-257).

"Why should this fear not leave me? It is long since the armada lost its bloom while moored upon the land, after setting forth to go beneath the walls of Troy,"—i. e. The event at Aulis which gave rise to my foreboding is so long past that my apprehensions are no longer justifiable.  $\Upsilon\pi' \Upsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$  is in this case a slightly pregnant expression =  $\delta\pi' \Upsilon\lambda\iota\omega \sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ , and the "start" referred to is the departure from Nauplia. A *primò facie* objection to this explanation may be suggested by the rocky nature of the coast in the neighborhood of Chalcis, as contrasted with the shore of the Troad. But Col. Leake tells us that the bay of Voulkos, a little southward from Chalcis on the opposite side, has a sandy or oozy bottom. A similar expression occurs in the Homeric hymn to Apollo, with reference to the Crissaeon gulf.

26. Ll. 1114-8. What is it that Cassandra sees? Surely the murderous contrivance which Clytemnestra avows in ll. 1382 foll., and which is exhibited in evidence of her crime in Cho. 980 foll.

(of which more hereafter). This being so, we cannot be wrong in explaining the words ἀλλ' ἄρκυς . . . φόνον to mean "Nay, but the net that takes him to his rest, that is the accomplice in his murder!"

27. L. 1137. *θοῶ* must not be changed to *θοεῖς*. It is better to change † *ἐπεγχεῖσα* to \* *ἐπεγγέαι*,—an epexegetic infinitive.

28. L. 1172. The intransitive meaning of *βαλῶ* is supported by Od. 11, 423, *χεῖρας ἀείρων | βάλλον ἀποθνήσκων περὶ φασγάνῳ*. For it would be too ridiculous to join *χεῖρας βάλλον* there.

29. L. 1181. For *πνέων*, as referring not to a wind but to the wave itself, cf. Eur. Hipp. 1210 (*ἀφρόν*) *πολὸν καχλάζον ποντίῳ φύσῃματι*.

30. Ll. 1271, 2. *καταγελωμένῃν μετὰ | φίλων, ὅπ' ἐχθρῶν*.

To what time does Cassandra here refer? If to any time at Troy, after her capture, how could she be mocked while under the protection of Agamemnon? If at Argos, have we not been witnesses of all that has happened since her arrival? The answer is that, for dramatic purposes, the harsh speeches of Clytemnestra, supra 1035 foll., supply a sufficient ground for this complaint. The words *μετὰ φίλων* consequently refer not to the Priamidae, but to Agamemnon.

31. L. 1300. *ὁ δ' ὅσπαστος γε τοῦ χρόνου πρεσβεύεται*.

That is, the latest moment is the best, where death is in question.

32. L. 1327-30. In these four lines, which Dindorf rightly gives to the Chorus (cf. supr. 351-4), I would retain the MS. reading *σκιὰ . . . τρέψειεν*, and give the usual meaning to *ταῦτ' ἐκείνων μᾶλλον*, viz., "the latter more than the former." "The prosperous course of human things may be turned aside by a shadow; and when they are unfortunate, they are like a painting which may be blurred out by throwing a wet sponge. The latter I pity much more than the former,"—i. e. I am more affected by the fate of Cassandra than by the fall of Troy.

33. L. 1343. *ἔσω*,

"In here," within the palace. The word so explained has a distinct motive, and is not mere surplusage. In calling for rescue it is natural to indicate the place to which the rescue is to be brought.

34. Ll. 1391, 2. *ἦ διὸς νότῳ*

† *γᾶν εἰ σπορητός*.

It deserves to be further considered whether

*διὸς νότῳ*

\* *γανᾶ*

is not on the whole a better emendation than Porson's

\* διοσδότω

\* γάνει.

The verb coming at the beginning of the line is more expressive than the dative.

35. L. 1395. ἐπισπένδειν νεκρῷ.

Clytemnestra has already in her mind the thought of a sacrifice, which she repeats *infr.* 1433. Libations were poured over the victim of an ordinary sacrifice. But the case is altered where the "victim" is the dead body of a man (νεκρός).

36. L. 1458 foll. The lost words may have drawn out the parallel between the two daughters of Tyndareus. The life now sacrificed by one of them is worth the many lives whose loss was caused by the other.

37. L. 1596. Mr. Paley does not seem to observe that ἄσημα . . . αὐτῶν means "without the marks for recognition which they" (the extremities) "would have afforded."

38. Ll. 1625-7. γύναι, σὺ τοὺς ἤκοντας ἐκ μάχης νέον—  
οἰκουρός, εὐνὴν ἀνδρὸς αἰσχύνουσ' ἄμα,  
ἀνδρὶ στρατηγῷ τόνδ' ἐβούλευσας μόνον;

Retaining this, the MS. reading, I would render: "Lady, didst thou (act thus) by him who is lately come from war? Keeping house for him, didst thou plot this death against the general of the host,—at the same time dishonoring thy husband's bed?" The Coryphaeus turns contemptuously from Aegisthus, and for the first time openly accuses the queen of unchastity. Her avowal, *supra* 1435 foll., now confirmed by the conduct of Aegisthus, has at last opened their eyes, and draws this taunt from them.

39. L. 1657. πρὸς †δόμους πεπρωμένους.

What is the "house appointed" for the elders? May not νομοῦς, "sphere," "place," "position," be the original reading, which, being changed to νόμους, has been misunderstood, and altered to δόμους? Cp. Eum. 576, where νόμῳ, the true reading, has been altered to δόμων.

These notes might be continued with remarks on the Choephoroe and Eumenides. But the reader who has followed so far, whether he agrees with me or not, has probably had enough. I will therefore conclude with one more observation. It has been commonly assumed that in Aeschylus, as in Homer and Sophocles, Clytemnestra murders her husband with an axe. But how can this be



reconciled with the words of Orestes (already quoted from Choeph. 1011), *ὡς ἔβαψεν Αἰγίσθου ξίφος*? For Aegisthus had no share in the actual murder. Clytemnestra did all with her own hand. The question to be answered was, "how came she by a lethal weapon?" And the answer is that Aegisthus, who was in the plot, had secretly provided her with his sword. In the Choephoroe, when in danger of her life from the return of her son, she calls loudly for a laborer's axe (Cho. 889-91). But at this point (the crisis of the trilogy) her criminal attitude is declared, and there is no one to "call her power to account."

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

## VI.—KELTIC AND GERMANIC.

Interest has been awakened of late in the study of the relations existing or supposed to exist between early Norse literature and early Irish. About a year ago A. C. Bang published, in Danish, a monograph on the *Voluspá*,<sup>1</sup> in which he contended that this part of the Edda is not of Germanic origin at all, but is a mere modification of early Jewish-Christian mysticism as embodied in the so-called Sibylline books. Many of the leading Norse scholars in Germany, Sweden and England have already expressed their assent. Objectors are not wanting, but in general we may say that the drift of opinion is in favor of the new interpretation. Its significance is obvious. If adopted in full, it will force us to reconstruct in great part the usual text-book systems of Eddaic mythology. What used to be regarded as the quintessence of Germanic cosmogony, as the most valuable record of primitive heathen belief, becomes now the merest dregs of a spurious Christianity. Yet it must be conceded that Bang's attack is a formidable one; it will not be easy to controvert either his premises or his conclusions. Going over the entire Sibylline literature very carefully, laying bare its growth, and delineating its chief traits, he puts his analysis by the side of the *Voluspá*, and asks if we can help recognizing between the two a vital connection both in form and in spirit. Were it necessary to be a specialist in Norse literature in order to appreciate the comparison, I should refrain from expressing any opinion. But the question is not one of mastering grammatical niceties or subtle mythological conceptions; it is rather an exercise of one's practical ability to recognize literary borrowing. As in the case of two pictures, we do not need to be artists to decide that one has borrowed its *motifs* from the other. Bang's argument can scarcely be met by asserting that the *Voluspá* and the Sibylline books may have had some common source. The Sibylline books are specifically Jewish-Christian, and consequently can not have anything in common with Germanic heathenism; they must have originated and developed themselves in Jewish-Christian communities of the

<sup>1</sup> Translated, with some additions, into German by J. C. Paestion, Vienna.

early Roman empire. There are only two ways of invalidating the new hypothesis: either to deny flatly all resemblance between Voluspá and Sibyl, or to impeach the accuracy of Bang's analysis of the Sibylline literature.

But it is one thing to establish a resemblance; another, to account for it. Just here Bang makes a *salto mortale*, and lands—in Ireland. Referring to Vigfusson's *Sturlunga Saga*, *Prolegomena* (Oxford, 1878), he says: "Keltic Ireland is evidently the intermediary (*Vermittlungsglied*) between the Voluspá and the Sibylline Oracles. The author of the Voluspá must, through contact with Irish-Keltic culture, have been put in a position to acquaint himself with the ancient Sibylline literature." Why this "evidently," or this "must"? Are there any direct evidences that the early Irish cultivated Sibylline literature to any extent whatever? No one will deny that Ireland was in the VII-Xth century a centre of religious and literary activity, that the Northmen were in the closest contact with Irish in Ireland proper and in the Western Isles, and borrowed from them not a few proper names and names of every-day objects. This thread of Irish nomenclature is so unmistakable in certain of the Eddaic poems that Vigfusson has been led to the belief "that these poems, with one or two exceptions, owe their origin to Norse poets in the Western Islands." It is somewhat significant that Vigfusson, although specifying some of them and their Irish peculiarities, does not mention the Voluspá. But is there anything in the Voluspá, or in the Sibylline books, that associates them unmistakably with Ireland? A glance at Vogt's *Essay on the Sibylline Prophecies*, Paul u. Braune, *Beiträge*, IV. 79 sqq., will teach us that the subject was widely known throughout the Middle Ages, early and late, and that its dissemination was due to the writings of such popular ecclesiastics as Augustine, Lactantius, Isidore, and Bede (or some unknown author believed at the time to be Bede). Are we at liberty, then, to infer, as Bang has done, that the author of the Voluspá, whoever he may have been, was indebted to Irish monks for his knowledge of the subject? The inference is not a logical one, and there is not a scrap of historical or linguistic evidence in its favor. It is as unsubstantiated as Vigfusson's conjecture, *Prolegomena* clxxxvii, respecting the *Sólarljóð*, namely, that it reminds us of "the sweetness and meekness of the Columbian Church." Our knowledge of the church of St. Columba<sup>1</sup> is not much clearer than our know-

<sup>1</sup> Is the Anglian name *Columba* in fact, as usually stated, the Latin for "dove," or is it a mere thickening of the Irish *colum*?

ledge of the church of St. Patrick. What the popular Irish conception of St. Colum Cillé was in those days, we may learn from the following Irish story, the composition of which is probably to be assigned to a time not very remote from the date of the *Sólar-ljóð*. The story runs thus: About the year 590 a great meeting was called in Ulster to settle certain points in dispute between Ireland and Scotland. King Aedh presided. The Scottish king brought with him to the conference St. Colum Cillé, to give advice. But King Aedh resented the saint's intrusion and gave orders to treat him with disrespect. Conall, the king's elder son, carries out the orders with gusto; but Domhnall, the younger, treats the saint with great kindness. The saint punishes Conall by prophesying for him a wandering and crazy life, and rewards Domhnall with the promise that he shall succeed to the throne. As soon as the mother hears of the malediction bestowed upon her favorite son, she sends her maid to the king to tell him that St. Colum Cillé must not receive the least token of respect from him. Thereupon the saint "prayed that the queen and her attendant should remain in the form of two cranes on the brink of the ford below forever," and the prayer was immediately granted (see O'Curry on *The Exile of the Children of Uisnech*, *Atlantis*, 1860, p. 393). Whatever the Anglo-Latin stories of St. Patrick and St. Colum Cillé may relate, the Irish stories at least do not suggest times of "sweetness and meekness."<sup>1</sup>

In endeavoring to trace relationships, we should, when external evidence is wanting, accept only such internal evidence as is unmistakable. One example of specifically Irish usages occurs in the *Leabhar Breac*. The MS. was written in the XIVth century, according to O'Curry; but the contents are of high antiquity. They are chiefly tracts on ecclesiastical subjects. Among others is a commentary on the canon of the mass, in which the commentator evidently presupposes a commingling of the elements in the

<sup>1</sup> In his *Lectures on the MS. Materials of Ancient Irish History*, p. 17, O'Curry mentions another incident like the above. One of the oldest ecclesiastical writings in Irish is the *Féiliré*, or *Metrical Festology of Aengus Celé Dé* (the "Culdee"). The author (or scribe) has appended to the text a note to this effect: "St. Colum Cillé having paid a visit to St. Longarad of Ossory, requested permission to examine his books, but Longarad having refused, Colum then prayed that his friend should not profit by his refusal, whereupon the books became illegible immediately after his death." May we supply a moral by guessing that these books (manuscripts) were of an ante-Christian, pagan nature?

chalice by pouring the wine upon the water. This is reversing the usual process, and the monkish symbolic interpretation put upon it is that the blood of Christ, the higher and more precious element, came down from above to the lower and grosser element of man and the world. Smith's Dictionary of Christian Antiquities (*sub* "Elements") mentions no instance of pouring the wine on the water. A marked peculiarity of this sort would be strong evidence. But the Sibylline prophecies are too vague, too universal, to be fixed upon any one church of the IXth or Xth century.

In his Icelandic Dictionary, p. 780, Vigfusson has given a list of forty-nine words, names and nicknames, of Keltic (Irish) origin occurring in the Landnama-Bók. Whitley Stokes, in the *Revue Celtique*, III. 186-191, has succeeded in identifying the Irish forms of all but a very few. The most important result of Mr. Stokes's examination is the light it throws on certain points in Middle-Irish pronunciation. Inasmuch as the Germanic colonists of Iceland knew nothing of conventional-historic Irish spelling, we may be sure that the forms of the Landnama-Bók represent the sounds of foreign words to an Icelandic ear. Thus the Icelandic name Kaðall, standing for Irish Cathall, shows that at that time (XIIth or XIth century) the Irish *th*, which is in modern Irish a mere breathing = *h*, must have sounded like *ð* or *p* in Anglo-Saxon. Similarly, the Melkorka of Landnama-Bók = Irish Mael-Curcaigh, "servant of Curcach," shows that Middle-Irish *gh* was silent in *auslaut*, as it is to-day. This last inference is an argument, it seems to me, against accepting Vigfusson's interpretation (see Prolegomena clxxxvi) of the title "Rigs-pula" (Rigs-mál). Vigfusson considers the *Rig-* to be the Gaelic (Irish) *righ*, king. But if the Irish *gh* was silent at the time when the Landnama-Bók was written, it must also have been silent when the Rigs-pula was written; for certainly no one can look upon the Rigs-pula as very old. And if the Irish themselves did not sound final *gh*, why should a Scandinavian poet, or scribe, writing by ear, introduce a *g*?

Another field of investigation which is rapidly becoming prominent is the international relationship, so to speak, of metres. Within the last three years two attempts have been made to establish a direct connection between Irish forms of verse and those of non-Keltic races. Namely, by Edzardi, in his essay entitled "Die skaldischen Versmasse und ihr Verhältniss zur keltischen (irischen) Verskunst," in Paul u. Braune, Beiträge, etc., V. 570 sqq.; and by Bartsch, "Ein keltisches Versmass im Provenzalischen u. Franzö-



sischen," in *Zts. für romanische Philologie*, II. 195 sqq. Both essays are unsatisfactory, for one reason at least, if for no other; their authors cannot lay claim to exact and original scholarship in Celtic philology. The services rendered by Bartsch to the study of Romance and Germanic literature are too well known to call even for mention; Edzardi is among the most promising students of Norse. But their knowledge of Irish literature is evidently got at second hand, if not at third hand, and, for such comparisons as they have in view, is wholly inadequate. Were the subject of Old-Irish metres one that had been treated exhaustively by competent scholars, and reduced to such a system that those not initiated in Celtic philology might grasp at least the cardinal points by reading carefully a few universally approved treatises, it would be possible and profitable for Bartsch, Edzardi and others like them to institute comparisons between Irish and Norse or Romance. But this is far from being the case; so far, indeed, that a perfectly candid searcher after the truth must say to himself again and again: of primitive Irish metres we know nothing, and as to Old and Middle-Irish verse-forms, the best of our knowledge is still to come.

The admission may sound, perhaps, too sweeping. Let me corroborate it, then, by the statements of Keltists high in repute. Bartsch's attempt at argument was, on the face of it, weak and haphazard; it was disposed of summarily by Jubainville, in the *Romania*, April, 1879. Bartsch fancied that he detected marked resemblances between Late-Latin and early Romance metres and Irish of the same age. As it is not at all probable that Continental verse-makers would borrow directly from Ireland, the inference, according to Bartsch, was that the two systems had a common origin, or that the Keltic system passed into the Roman in consequence of the colonization of Gaul. To this Jubainville replied, in substance if not in words, that Bartsch evidently knew nothing about the fundamental principles of Celtic philology.

In order to make Jubainville's strictures perfectly clear, I shall have to recapitulate the main points very briefly. Our knowledge of Irish in its earliest forms is derived chiefly from glosses written by Irish monks in Latin manuscripts. Occasionally we get in these glosses a passage long enough to afford a continuous text; but usually the glosses consist of detached words and phrases, used merely to explain the Latin text that they accompany. The Irish of the glosses, called specifically Old-Irish, dates from the eighth and ninth centuries. Possibly some of it may be dated as early as the

seventh century. It is upon this glossae-Irish that the great *Grammatica Celtica* of Zeuss (revised by Ebel) is for the most part based. Middle-Irish is the designation of the language at a later stage, say from the beginning of the twelfth century. The most celebrated Irish manuscript of this period, i. e. written entire in Irish, is the *Leabhar na huidre*, or Book of the Dun Cow, written about 1100. It is a collection of stories, some of which have been edited and translated separately. The entire MS. has been published in facsimile by the Royal Irish Academy. See Windisch, *Kurzgefasste Irische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1879, p. 6.

But Irish of the eighth or even of the seventh century cannot be called very old. In fact, one of the constant regrets among Celtic philologists is that they have no Celtic remains, whether in Irish, Gaulish or Welsh, that can do for their study what the fragments of Wulfila's Gothic translation of the Bible have done for Germanic philology. Zeuss, Ebel and their successors have wrought wonders with the materials at their disposal. They have profited, of course, by the results of general Indo-Germanic philology. But there is not one of them, I am confident, but would consider his study placed upon an infinitely more satisfactory basis could he only succeed in unearthing an Irish text of ten or twenty pages of the third or fourth century. The difference is not one of age alone; it is one of character. Old-Irish has "sloughed off" many termination-syllables, especially in the declension of nouns and adjectives. Some of them we can restore approximately, by conjecture, but only approximately. What we need is a genuine Irish text giving these terminations in such an unmistakable form that we can readily explain by their aid all the curious phenomena of aspiration, eclipsis and infection. Nevertheless we know, by inference, that the terminations must have survived down to a time not much anterior to the glossae. This early stage of the language has been called "prehistoric"; perhaps a better term would be "preliterate." According to Jubainville, prehistoric Irish was still in vogue even in the seventh century. In Old-Irish, the genitive singular of the word "son" has become *maic*. This presupposes a prehistoric *magi*, of which the *-i* has been absorbed into and assimilated with the stem. As a matter of fact we do find the form *magi* in Irish inscriptions. See Romania, p. 145. Compare also the Gaulish names *Segomari*, *Druticni*, *Dannotali*, Whitley Stokes, *Three Irish Glossaries*, p. lv, note §. If such inflexional syllables, then, subsisted as late as the sixth and seventh centuries, no Irish or Gaulish verse in the days of the

Republic or early Empire can be imagined without them. To quote Jubainville's words: "As late as the year 700 Irish still retained its external (=terminal) inflexions. Hence not one of the Irish verses that we possess can be anterior to this date, for it is clear that if we were to restore the external inflexions (terminations), most of the verses could no longer stand on their feet."

The argument, it will be observed, not only overthrows Bartsch's fancied analogies, but it lays down a doctrine which cannot be apprehended too clearly. Primitive Irish verse must have been made up of words retaining certain terminal syllables of inflexion. We do not possess any such verse, consequently we must first find some before constructing our theory.

Edzardi's position is quite different from Bartsch's; he attempts merely to show that some of the metres used by the Skalds are reproductions of well-known Irish forms of verse. There is nothing impossible, or even improbable, in such a hypothesis. The Northmen were for centuries in contact with the Irish, and may well have borrowed from them in more ways than one. But Edzardi's way of going to work is not likely to give satisfaction; it reads very much as if the author, at home in one domain, had strayed off into another, and, bent on finding resemblances, had picked them up by chance. Thus, I doubt if any critical student of Irish metres would at the present day consult O'Donovan's grammar for specimens of early versification. O'Donovan's work was published in 1845, before even the first edition of Zeuss. Not only is it far behind the demands of the age, but its author never intended it for more than a treatise on modern Irish. His remarks upon Old Irish are only incidental to a practical treatment of the living tongue. The few examples of so-called early verse that he gives are taken from writers of the fourteenth century, and later. Edzardi, it is true, cites some Old and Middle Irish verses, communicated to him, he states, by Windisch. But is not this a mere loan *ad hoc*? Were Edzardi as much at home in Irish as he unquestionably is in Icelandic, he would not need to borrow from Windisch's still unpublished volume of "Texts." Numerous publications by Whitley Stokes, O'Curry, Crowe, Hennessy and other scholars would have yielded him all the materials he could possibly utilize. May I venture upon a blunt question without giving offence? Namely, what is the good of comparisons instituted by scholars who are not equally familiar with both objects to be compared?

The study of Old and Middle Irish is a formidable undertaking.

The forms of the language are complicated, the idiomatic structure is uncommonly puzzling. Dictionaries, accurate literary and political histories, almost all helps are wanting. The student must fight his way through by sheer force of will, inch by inch. It is the last field for guess-work. No one can "skim" Old Irish as many of us "skim" French or Italian. As to the verse-structure, in particular, the honestest course for us will be to admit promptly that until all the Irish verse-texts are edited, it will not be possible to construct a system. And the *most important* text of all is still buried in manuscript, namely, the treatise on metres contained in the Book of Ballymote.

O'Donovan, at p. 427 of his grammar, says: "There is a curious tract on Irish versification in the Book of Ballymote, which deserves to be studied." From O'Donovan's point of view it was perhaps sufficient to refer to this tract as "curious"; but modern scholars will assuredly deem it something more. Thus Crowe, in his annotated edition and translation of the *Siabur-Charpat Con Culaind* (*Demoniac Chariot of Cu Chulaind*), in the *Kilkenny Journal*, Jan. 1871, says, p. 409, "All the requisites for the perfect composition of every species of poetry are laid down in the treatise . . . in the Book of Ballymote . . . I may have the opportunity of printing the Ballymote tract before long." Unfortunately Crowe did not live to carry out his purpose. Mr. Hennessy, in informing me that he had a copy of the tract, made by himself, added, "It is *very* hard." I am quite willing to take his word for it. Professor Zimmer has also a copy, I believe. Both gentlemen agree in the high estimate to be put upon the tract. The manuscript of the Book of Ballymote is not especially old; O'Curry assigns it to the latter part of the fourteenth century. But, like so many other Irish manuscripts, it is an immense compilation ("502 pp. of the largest folio vellum") from much earlier sources. Among other things it contains the Irish Book of Nennius, ed. in 1848 by Todd and Herbert for the Archaeological Society. The chief value of the tract on versification will doubtless be found to consist in its numerous specimens of the earliest forms of verse taken from manuscripts no longer in existence. Certainly Crowe, who was up to the time of his death in the foremost rank of Irish scholarship, would not have expressed himself so unreservedly, had he not been convinced of the importance of this tract.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Are Continental scholars as well acquainted as they should be with Crowe's articles in the *Kilkenny Journal* and O'Curry's in the *Atlantis*? I fear they are not. Otherwise Professor Windisch would have escaped the misstatement



The indispensableness of a thorough knowledge of Old-Irish versification is illustrated by Crowe in another paper, *The Guardsman's Cry of St. Patric, Kilkenny*, April, 1869, p. 290. Here he shows how O'Curry, for want of such knowledge, printed as prose a passage in the *Sick Bed of Cu Chulaind* which is in verse (see *Atlantis*, p. 388). Also that Whitley Stokes, in his *Goidelica*, misread and misinterpreted several lines of the *Hymn of St. Brocan, Liber Hymnorum*.

Crowe's remarks upon the distinction between poet (*fili*) and bard are significant enough to warrant quotation. He says, p. 287: "There are in Irish two kinds of poetry—the one metrical, the other not. The latter species was the composition of the *fili*, never of the bard, who always sang in metre and in rhyme . . . The *fili*, although originally the only poet, and a poet only, grew at length, in direct antithesis to the fate of the Greek *χωμικός*, to be the poet *par excellence*, the teacher of philosophy, philology, rhetoric . . . All those mysterious compositions supposed to produce supernatural effects, such as incantations, satires, cries of poesy (of the last-named class is our *Guardsman's Cry*), were the works of the *fili*, while at the same time his undergraduate course included all the metrical rules of the bard. Thus we see that the *fili* and the bard were quite distinct, yet all our modern scholars have mixed them up together under the general name of bards. We read, for example, everywhere that at the synod of Druimm Cetta, St. Columba succeeded in retaining the bards in Ireland. But at this synod there was no question whatever about the bards; it was the *filis* and their disciples that created the disturbance at the time. The bards never taught, had no disciples—being, in fact, a modern and non-associate institution, and represented as such in our manuscripts . . . The *fili*, on the other hand, may be traced back to the remotest period, and indeed his title claims this antiquity, at least if the following idea as to the origin of the name can have any value. In Zeuss 274, *las na fileda* is glossed *apud comicos*, which would seem to be an exact translation. As from the Greek stem *χωμ-* we have *χώμη*, village; *χωμός*, village revel; *χωμικός*, village poet; so from the Irish stem *fel* we have *fel* or *fele*, an inclosure; *fled* (written in full *file* in the *Lebor na huidre*), a village feast; and *fili*, a village poet."

(p. 115 of his *Kurzgefasste Irische Grammatik*) that his third text, p. 118, *Ectra Condla Chaim*, etc., had never before appeared in print. The entire passage, i. e. Irish text, with introduction, translation and notes, was published by Crowe in the *Kilkenny Journal*, April, 1874, under the title "*Adventures of Condla Ruad*."



The author has not defined this "non-metrical" poetry of the *filis*, beyond saying that it "has various forms. In some cases it consists of a certain number of *bricht* (eight-syllable combinations) in one or more divisions." But he goes on to say, p. 289, "for the making of an Irish poem, metrical or not, there are, as regards expression, certain laws, the three principal of which are defined as follows in the ancient preface to the *Lebor na huidre* copy of the *Amra*," namely, "return," "re-narration" and "reduplication." The "return" is "the doubling of one word in one place in the round and without following it from that out." Example: *Dia, Dia, dorrogus*, God, God, I beseech him. Another example, in a metrical composition, is this quatrain from the Book of Ballymote tract:

O splendid boy, sing Brian's poem,  
Sing Brian's poem, O splendid boy:  
Brian of the Kine's plain, palm of Fal's men,  
Palm of Fal's men, Brian of the Kine's plain.

"Re-narration is re-narrating from a like mode, i. e. the one word, to say it frequently in the round with the intervention of other words between them." Example, the repetition of *niurt*, "power," at the beginning of each line in one passage in the Guardsman's Cry:

1. May there come to me to-day the "power" (*niurt*), the strong title Trinity, etc.
2. May there come to me to-day the "power" of Christ's birth, etc.
3. May there come to me to-day the "power" of seraphim's orders, etc.

An example of "re-narration" in metre is contained in a quatrain of the Siabur Charpat Con Culaind:

I was not a hound of round-lapping of leavings,  
I was a hound of slaying of troops;  
I was not a hound of watching of calves,  
I was a hound of watching of Emain.

The first and third lines begin with *nipsa* (= *ni basa*), "I was not," the second and fourth with *basa*, "I was." "Reduplication is refolding, that is, bi-geminating." Example: *Agur, agur, iar cein chein*, I fear, I fear, after long long.

These three processes, then, return, re-narration, re-duplication, underlie *all* Irish poetry, according to Crowe. Do they not produce upon the ear and the imagination an impression akin to that

created by the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, or by the amplifications and repetitions of Anglo-Saxon alliteration? "O splendid boy, sing Brian's poem," etc., recalls to me immediately the celebrated lament of David over Absalom. When the composer of the *Beowulf*-poem sings, vv. 1647-1649;

ðá wæs be feaxe      on flett boren  
Grendles heáfod,      ðær guman druncon,  
egeslic for eorlum,      and ðære idese mid,

we of to-day have to construe each half line with the one that stands under it and not with the one by its side, and we read: Then was by the hair Grendel's head, terrible to the knights, brought into the hall where the men were drinking, and their wives with them. The difference between the Anglo-Saxon return and the Irish is no less evident than the resemblance; the *fili* states a thought fully and then re-states it; the *scóp* states his thought half and comes back to finish it. Both methods are in strictness rhetorical rather than poetical, and each is the counterpart of the other.

How far Crowe's views may have been accepted among Keltists, and how far their adoption would facilitate the study of Old-Irish versification, are points upon which I can scarcely venture to have an "opinion." There is one "suspicion," however, that continually thrusts itself upon me, to wit, that we shall not be able to study the genesis of the Irish system until we have forms more primitive than any we now have. One of the oldest specimens is contained in the lines scribbled on the margin of the St. Gall manuscript of Priscian. The first *rann* (quatrain) runs thus:

Is acher in gáith innocht  
Fufuasna fairggae findfolt  
Ni ágor-reimm mora minn  
Dond laechraid lainn oa Lochlind.

Is sharp (violent) the wind the (= this) night  
Agitates the ocean white hair (foam?)  
Not fear I (a) crossing of the sea clear  
By the warrior-troop fierce from Scandinavia.

The translation is from Jubainville's French, but modified here and there in accordance with Windisch's glossary. The verse-flow may be marked thus:

is acher in gáith innócht, etc.

Lines 1 and 2 are regarded as riming (= assonant), *-nocht: folt*; also lines 3 and 4, *minn: -lind*. Even more evident to a Germanist

are the alliterations *is, in, in; fu-, fair-, find; mora, minn; lacch-, lainn, -lind.*

Is verse of this kind primitive? It sounds to me too complicated. Rime (i. e. terminal rime) is quite sufficient to give character to verse; alliteration is also of itself sufficient. But the two together stand in each other's way, and have a ring of artificiality, especially when the number of syllables must be counted with scrupulous exactness. The above quatrain, e. g., has exactly twenty-eight. If the earliest Irish *filis* were indeed, as Crowe defines them, "village" poets, they must have sung in measures more rustic than any edited by Crowe himself, by Stokes, or by Zeuss. And by "rustic" I do not mean *bänkelsängerisch*. The quatrain cited has, to my ear at least, a decided ballad-jingle, which is the token of decadence and mannerism. It is no better and no worse than scores of medieval monkish songs in Latin. I use the word "rustic" as Crowe has used the word *χωμικός*, a poet of the people reciting to the people in a strain with which all are equally conversant. Rustic = *volksmässig*. Our Anglo-Saxon alliterative verse is the best vehicle of truly popular poetry. Even had Bede failed to transmit to us the charming little story of Caedmon, we might conjecture from internal evidence that alliteration was something in which all could have a share. It is perfectly simple, dignified, powerful and flexible; it expresses evidently all that the Old-German mind was capable of conceiving. If we weed out the palpable monkish interpolations and blunderings from our *Beowulf*-poem, we shall have left one of the most vigorous and straightforward of poems in any language, ancient or modern. We can readily picture to ourselves the followers of a king of Old England reciting long passages of it from the mead-bench around the winter fireside.

The essence of Old-German poetry is its alliteration. Whether we hold by the old four-beat (*Vierhebungen*) theory or reject it in favor of the two-beat, we cannot but admit that "no alliteration, no verse."<sup>1</sup> May not a like disposition have prevailed in the earliest Irish verse? Nothing could be farther from my purpose than to hint, however vaguely, at the possibility of German and Irish verse having a common origin. I take the liberty merely of suggesting a change in the method of approaching—what the French would call

<sup>1</sup> So strong was this taste for alliteration that it affected, we may say vitiated, Old-English prose, or what should have been prose. Compare ten Brink, *Gesch.* p. 140, with Grein's ed. of Aelfric's *Judges*, first in *Bibl. d. An. S. Prosa*, p. 253, then in *Anglia* II. 142.

*envisager*—Irish verse. Hitherto scholars have busied themselves almost exclusively with examining into the laws or usages of rime (assonance), syllable-counting and line-arrangement in Irish. Might they not, possibly with more profit, study the principles underlying Irish alliteration? If the result should be to establish the priority of alliteration over rime, we could then assert of Irish what is unquestionably true of Old-German and Old-English, that rime has *supplanted* alliteration.

Attempts like that of Bartsch to explain the development of mediæval Latin forms of verse by assuming the intrusion of Irish methods into Latin, seem to me to be putting the cart before the horse. We cannot yet say that we are fully enlightened on all points in the growth of mediæval Latin verse. Although much has been done in the way of editing, more remains to be done in the way of systematizing. But are not the general facts sufficiently clear, namely, that mediæval riming Latin grew out of the church service, which required for its chants, antiphonies, sequences, etc., a flow of strongly marked accents at regular intervals, with strongly marked pauses? Given on the one hand a musical notation, on the other hand a language like Latin abounding in long words and terminations that lend themselves spontaneously to rime, what need can there be of going outside of Latin to Keltic in quest of a source for rime? The conjecture that a few Irish monks scattered here and there in Franco-Gallia and Lombard-Italy could have played a determining part in shaping the liturgy of so cosmopolitan an institution as the Western Church, is too hazardous to be accepted without the most conclusive proof. We know that Latin metres or their lineal descendants, Old French and Provençal, were strong enough to supplant permanently the alliterative system of the Germans and Anglo-Saxons. It is not a mere "chance" of history that the measure of the Heliand should have passed away, whereas the far clumsier verses of Otfrid's *Christ* should have determined the forms of all subsequent German poetry. Is our knowledge of the early Irish, then, of a kind to warrant us in claiming for them a profounder genius and a tougher vitality? The study of Keltic literature and mythology is but in its beginnings; it offers to its followers a field of the most original investigation. But its friends will do it harm, not good, by claiming for it too much honor. In the absence of unmistakable proof, we shall be safe in assuming that of the two worlds, the Roman and the Keltic, the former was the giver, the latter the receiver.

J. M. HART.

## NOTES.

### VARIA.

I.—I. *Μέμφομαι*. The word *μέμφομαι* sometimes has a meaning not provided for in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon. Hence a recent editor of extracts from Greek Lyric Poets has given it a forced rendering not demanded by the context. Archil. XII begins:

*Κήδεα μὲν στονόεντα, Περικλέες, οὔτε τις ἀστῶν  
μεμφόμενος θαλίης τέρψεται οὐδὲ πόλις.*

Here he renders *μεμφόμενος*, 'bemoaning,' evidently construing the negative only with *τέρψεται*, and inventing a meaning for *μέμφομαι*, or rather borrowing it from Buchholz. That *μεμφόμενος* could be taken in a causal sense and construed outside of the negative, cannot be denied, only its *meaning* does not suit. Blass more properly renders it "*geringachtend*," and of course the negative then includes it. Other examples where it has a similar signification are so familiar that it is difficult to see how they have been overlooked, or why they have been neglected, by our lexicographers. In the Hecuba of Euripides, the heroine, in conversation with Agamemnon, threatens to punish Polymestor with the aid of other women. Agamemnon asks how women are to receive the strength of men. Hecuba answers (884):

*δεινὸν τὸ πλῆθος, ξὺν δόλῳ τε δύσμαχον,*

to which Agamemnon replies (885):

*δεινόν· τὸ μέντοι θῆλυ μέμφομαι γένος.*

At this verse a scholiast says: *μέμφομαι· καταγινώσκω καὶ φαῦλον ἡγοῦμαι· ἀσθενὲς γὰρ καὶ μαλακόν*. So in Hercules Furens, 189, *μέμφει* clearly has a similar sense, i. e. *think little of, despise, contemn*. One phase of this sense is 'to disregard,' which suits the passage in Archilochus.

2. *Euripides Alcest.* 403. The *pruritus emendandi* of Herwerden is well known. N. Wecklein, having spoken of this (Bursian's Jahresbericht, XIII, p. 38), says: In Folge dieser Eilfertigkeit kommen mitunter Conjecturen zum Vorschein, die geradezu feh-



lerhaft sind (Hel. 1398, οὐ περ ὄνθ', etc.) oder dem Zusammenhange widersprechen (Herc. 679, κελαδῶ, etc.) *oder auch absurde Vorstellungen geben* (Alc. 403, ὁ σὸς ποτὶ σοῖσι πίτνων γόνασιν νεοσσός, etc.). Without defending the mass of Herwerden's conjectures, or even maintaining that this particular conjecture is to be accepted, I propose to defend it against Wecklein's criticism. His authority is justly held so high that an error on his part is unusually dangerous. Unfortunately he does not tell us wherein exists the 'absurdity'; but that there is no absurdity in the *act* or *situation* (from a Euripidean standpoint at least) is shown by Suppl. 284-5, ἃ περὶ σοῖσι γόνασιν ὥδε πίτνω, 278 ἀμφιπίτνουσα τὸ σὸν γόνυ, 10 προσπίτνους' ἐμὸν γόνυ, and many other examples; for the boy Eumelos is in the attitude of supplication (ὀπάκουσον, ἄκουσον, ὦ μήτερ, ἀντιάζω σ' ἐγὼ σ' ἐγὼ, μήτερ, καλοῦμαι ὁ σὸς ποτὶ κτέ.), although he knows his mother is dead. Wecklein must see the absurdity, therefore, in a νεοσσός falling at the knees; but this is not objectionable. The 'falling at the knees' is no part of a figure, but is literal, and νεοσσός, as elsewhere in Euripides, merely amounts to 'child,' 'darling.' With στόμασιν we are so accustomed to think of a young bird (and yet πίτνων is then unsuitable), that it is difficult to banish the image from the mind even when we read γόνασιν—an image that would never have been created if we had always read γόνασιν. If this is not Wecklein's trouble, I am unable to see what is.

II. *Aristophanea* 1. *EA*. Whether εἶα as an exclamation was not originally the imperative of ἐάω ('hold!') I shall not discuss; but its primary use as an interjection is to indicate surprise in its strict sense, not necessarily astonishment or wonder. This surprise is usually at something sudden or unexpected (though not wonderful) which *occurs*, and calls forth remark or leads to an interruption of conversation already going on. From this use naturally comes the other, where it is employed when something startling *in its nature* is *told*. In both its uses it is placed first—that is, it introduces the remark (or the other ejaculations) caused by the occurrence or the statement. If it is ever employed otherwise, examples have escaped me. There are many passages where there is doubt whether we should read εἶα εἶα or ἀἶ, and in not a few cases ἐγ seems to have a similar use. (See Aesch. Prom. 114, Agam. 1125, Choeph. 1047; Prom. 151, 158, Soph. Oed. Col. 149, Trach. 1004, 1014, etc.) But these are also employed in other circumstances, and hence εἶα is occasionally confounded with them in some MSS. As an instance of its weakest use may be cited Plat. Prot. 314. Knocking is heard

at the door. Some one opens it and says, "Εἰ, σοφισταί τινες, 'Why, here are some philosophers.' As illustrations of all its uses see the following examples taken at random from the dramatists: Aesch. Prom. 298, 687, Soph. Oed. Col. 1477, Eur. Androm. 895, Bacch. 644, Hec. 501, 733, 1116, Elect. 341, 557, 747, Heracl. 73, Herc. Fur. 514, 815, 1088, Suppl. 91, Hippol. 1390, Iph. Aul. 316, 643, 1131, Iph. Taur. 1156, Ion 153, 170, 241, 540 (Witz.), 1549, Med. 1005, Orest. 277, Rhés. 574, 675, 885, Tro. 298, 1256, Aristoph. Nub. 1259, Pax 60, Av. 1495, Thesmo. 699, 1105.

These remarks have been made more especially to prepare the way for criticizing certain readings in Aristophanes. In Pax a servant has been speaking, and then we read (Dind. v. 60):

Trygaeus: ἔα ἔα.

Servant: σιγήσαθ', ὡς φωνῆς ἀκούειν μοι δοκῶ.

Then Trygaeus proceeds to address to Zeus a sort of soliloquy (if we may so speak). Our surprise is removed when we cast our eyes at the margin and see: 60. ἔα ἔα *servo continuatum in libris Trygaeo tribuit Brunckius*. It should be restored to the servant. It is true, we should then have nothing *in the text* to represent the φωνή which the servant heard; but that is nothing uncommon. (See Ran. 312 ff.).

Again, in the Nubes, Strepsiades has just driven a creditor from the stage, when is heard without ἰὼ μοί μοι, whereupon Strepsiades:

ἔα.

τίς οὐτοσί ποτ' ἔσθ' ὁ θρηγῶν;

Here Bakhuyzen (De Parodia in Com. Aristoph.) strangely assigns ἔα to the voice without.

It may be further remarked that there is no propriety in Liddell and Scott's observation that ἔα is *rare in prose*. It is rare in the same sense that Neptune is rarely in perihelion. It is used whenever time and occasion call for it, and this does not, from the nature of the matter, happen so often in prose as in the drama; but the remark of L. and S. would lead one to suppose that it is poetical.

2.—Bakhuyzen, with others, attributes the *whole* of Aristoph. Ach. 540 to Euripides. In Aristoph. it runs thus:

ἔρεϊ τις, οὐ χρῆν' ἀλλὰ τί ἐχρῆν εἶπατε,

and the scholiast says 'ἔρεϊ τις, οὐ χρῆν' is from Euripides' Telephus. Of course, among the fragments of Euripides it is written with τί χρῆν εἶπατε. This, however, is neither tragic nor comic. τῇ gives Bakhuyzen no trouble, as he writes (Aristoph. Frag. 525)

*ἀρπαγῇ τρέφων* without remark. If we admit this quantity, it must be tragic; but it cannot be: *τί* and *χρῆν* are too closely connected to stand before the fifth caesura. Perhaps, then, after all, the scholiast meant what he said.

3.—We are in constant danger of finding parodies in Aristophanes where none exist; but Ach. 790,

*ὁμοματρία γάρ ἐστι κῆχ τῶντῳ πατρός,*

reminds me always so forcibly of Soph. Antig. 513,

*ὅμαιμος ἐκ μιᾶς τε καὶ ταύτου πατρός,*

that I must call attention to it, as Bakhuyzen does not mention it.

Also Av. 1245,

*ἀρ' οἴσθ' ὅτι Ζεὺς εἴ με λυπήσει πέρα, κτέ.,*

with its confused construction, is very suggestive of Antig. 2 ff, if we do not adopt the late "emendations" to the latter.

The whole passage, Av. 316-335, is clearly a *παρατραγωδία*, not, of course, one in which the exact metrical form has been followed.

Bakhuyzen seems to have given himself needless trouble to show that Ran. 1443-4,

*ὅταν τὰ νῦν ἄπιστα πίσθ' ἡγώμεθα,*

*τὰ δ' ὄντα πίστ' ἄπιστα, κτέ.,*

are taken from some lost play of Euripides. It will be observed that in the first of these two verses we have, omitting the accents, *ἀπισταπισθ'*, which might be *ἀπιστ' ἀπισθ'*; and in the other verse, *ὄνταπισταπιστα*, which might be *ὄντ' ἀπιστ' ἀπιστα*, or *ὄντ' ἀπιστα πιστα* or *ὄντα πιστα πιστα*; and but for the accents, the passage would have been hopelessly obscure, and in any case must have been puzzling. It seems to me that the comedian was merely ridiculing Hec. 689,

*ἄπιστ' ἄπιστα καὶνὰ καὶνὰ δέρχομαι.*

The passage is, moreover, not of the paradoxical sort to which B. refers for illustration.

4.—In reference to the Promethean scene in Av., Bakhuyzen says (p. 89): *Saepius mihi vss. 1494 sqq. legenti videbantur haec omnia quae de Prometheo agunt revera faceta non esse neque summo comico digna nisi quodammodo cum Promethei historia cohaerent, i. e. veri Promethei parodiam continerent.* He then proceeds to show, with considerable elaboration, that the *Προμηθεὺς Πυρφόρος* must not only have existed, but have occupied the *first*

place in the trilogy; and he then explains the above scene as a parody on some similar scene in the *Περφόρος*, maintaining that it would otherwise be 'omnino τῆς φορτικῆς χωμωδίας.' His arguments with reference to the *Περφόρος* appear to be, in the main, very sound, and he has, perhaps, made some contributions to the solution of that vexed question; but the assumption of a *Περφόρος* is surely not essential for the explanation of this scene in Aristophanes. In the first place, the myth was sufficiently familiar to make the people enjoy what may be called a *parody* on it, whether they had ever witnessed it on the stage or not. And, in the second place, is it certain that Aristophanes always practiced what he preached? In the very play where he censures the *φορτικὴ χωμωδία* he indulges in it himself to an extent which seems to have displeased the people; and the play opens and closes with scenes condemned in the parabasis. Hundreds of passages may be pointed out in his works which are designed solely to create vulgar laughter. I believe that the attempt to acquit Aristophanes of this charge has prevented critics from explaining Av. 1213 (*σφραγίδ' ἔχεις*) by referring to v. 560. The sheer absurdity of the thing constituted its humor. Hearing v. 1213 some half-hour after v. 560, the people could not but associate them together. This the poet knew, and hence intended that they should.

But to return to the Promethean scene: I have always enjoyed it as much as any other scene in all the poet's plays, and this is the case with many other readers of Aristophanes. M. Haupt regarded it as the finest scene in that play. And why? Because every one is even now sufficiently familiar with the story of Prometheus to enjoy seeing it parodied, or, rather, presented in caricature. Of course it *may* have been a parody on the *Περφόρος*, but, I say, it is not at all *necessary* to assume anything of the sort.<sup>1</sup>

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

<sup>1</sup> Those who are familiar with modern parodic literature, especially those who have ever been guilty of trying to add to the stock of it, will appreciate the justness of Professor Humphreys's remark; and if perchance any of our readers remembers Aytoun's *Firmilian*, a *Spasmodic Tragedy*, which had, I believe, some little success in its day, will be able to recall a number of travestied situations which are enjoyable without any reference to the poets ridiculed. So in reading the *Wasps* with a class some time since I was amused by a parallelism which suggested itself to me for the first time between the situation of Philokleon in the confinement of his house, and that of Danae in her tower. Bdelykleon corresponds to Akrisios, and an analogous chorus would not be far to seek. The measures are plaintive, indeed caterwauling, and would suit a

ON *πίαρ* AS AN ADJECTIVE.

In the Fragments of Solon, XXXVI, vv. 18-21 (ed. Bergk) occurs the following passage:

κέντρον δ' ἄλλος ὡς ἐγὼ λαβὼν  
κακοφραδῆς τε καὶ φιλοκτῆμων ἀνὴρ  
οὔτ' ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον οὔτ' ἐπαύσατο,  
πρὶν ἂν ταράξας *πίαρ* ἐξέλεη γάλα.<sup>1</sup>

Now it is commonly held that *πίαρ* is a noun, and noun only, and accordingly it has been so translated here. This would make the passage mean: "before he had stirred up the milk and taken out the fat." But as it is not usual to stir up milk when it is wanted to skim off the cream, this is hardly a satisfactory interpretation, and it seems necessary to take *πίαρ* as an adjective, and to understand with Buchholtz, from the preceding line, δῆμον as the object of ταράξας; or simply to render it: "before he had stirred up and filched away the creamy milk," i. e. the milk made fat by being

*serenade* or rather *aubade* under the windows of a prisoner. In fact my impression of the plaintive character is so strong that I cannot force myself to read v. 273 (τί ποτ' οὐ) and v. 281 (τάχα δ' ἂν) logaoedically or otherwise than as a modification of *ionici*, as Dindorf and Fritzsche would have us to do. Metricians should remember that Aristophanes could be frolicsome. Of course the orthodox thing to do, as soon as the notion of parody presents itself, is to look for the original word. After I had amused myself with the parallel between Philokleon and the lovely heroine, I examined the fragments of the Danae of Euripides. Unfortunately there are no lyric remains. The prologue and the beginning of the first scene are by a late hand, but it would appear from certain indications that the play began at the point in the story where Danae is still shut up in the tower after having borne the babe Perseus to Zeus; and we can readily imagine Akrisios to have announced to the chorus the sin or the misfortune of the heroine, and the chorus to hold converse with Danae, who wishes to come out or to be metamorphosed in common with all the disconsolate widows, wives and maids of Euripides. But I maintain that the fun of the situation is not dependent on the parody of any definite scene, and we must be satisfied with that general travesty of the mythological world which was one of the elements of the old comedy. B. L. G.

<sup>1</sup> Mr Allinson's note reminds me that I have always been tempted to give v. 21 its normal syntax by reading: πρὶν ἀναταράξας *πίαρ* ἐξεῖλεν γάλα. The reading πρὶν ἂν with the subj. after an unreal condition of the past requires a rather violent *repraesentatio*, such as I cannot at the moment parallel for this conjunction. Of course we might also have ἀναταράξας ἐξελεῖν as in Eur. Alc. 362. In looking over my collection I find a droll coincidence under πρότερον ἢ in Hdt. 8, 93: οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσατο πρότερον ἢ εἰλε μιν. B. L. G.



stirred up with the cream. "A man less pure than I," says Solon, "would have broken down class distinctions to take advantage of the result."

Were this the only instance where it seemed preferable to translate *πίαρ* as an adjective, we might well hesitate to do so; but in Homer Od. II 135, ἐπεὶ μάλα πίαρ ὅπ' οὐδας, the sense is certainly better, if we translate the word as an adjective. Buttmann, it is true, in his Lexilogus (art. *πίαρ*), denies very emphatically that there is any ground for considering it an adjective. But he had neglected altogether the passage of Solon quoted above, which, as will readily be admitted, more than doubles the uncertainty about translating the word as a noun in the Homeric line. Buttmann's objections to the sense of the translation, "fat is the ground beneath," seem entirely without weight, as it surely requires no imagination to speak of the ground as "beneath," whether it be in relation to anything in particular (as here to the *standing crop*) or left indefinite (as in the imitation of the passage in the Odyssey, Hymn. ad Apoll. v. 61). Furthermore, it seems perfectly evident that *πίαρ* stands just in the relation to *μάλα* that *βαθύ* does to the same word in the preceding line.

One further consideration to be weighed against Buttmann's arguments is the definition of Hesychius, who gives us as the third meaning of *πίαρ*, "καὶ λιπαρόν."

Turning now to the structure of the word itself, we find this form *πίαρ*: the adjective of two terminations *πίων*, *πίον*: the rather anomalous feminine adjective *πίειρα*: and finally, in Aristotle and Hippocrates, the adjective *πιρός* or *πιερός*. All of these come from the root *πι* and are perfectly well established.

The Sanskrit correlates are very striking, and help to throw light on the question: 1. *Pīvan*=*πιFon*. 2. With the derivative suffix *vara* is formed *pīvara*, which is the same as *πιFapa* (stem of *πιρός*). 3. As feminine of the Sanskrit adjective *pīvara* we have *pīvari*; if this, as is very probable, represents an original *pīvariā*, we should have an exact correspondence with the Greek *πιFερια*, which, by metathesis gives us the existing form *πιFειρα*.

Without further support, this correspondence, complete as it is, might seem only a curious coincidence. Some corroboration, however, may be obtained within the Greek itself. The adjective *μάζαρ*, *μάζαιρα* (*μάζαρ*), seems to have been formed nearly, if not quite, analogously to *πίαρ*. Buttmann, it is true, notices it only to deny this analogy; but the word is composed of *μαζ* (cf. Lat. *mac-to*)

and the suffix *ap*, which is the same in both words whatever it represents. It is further objected that the feminine form *πίσιρα* cannot bear the same relation to *πίαρ* that *μάχαιρα* does to its masculine. But Curtius, Gr. Etym. No. 455, says: "*μάγειρος* ist wohl aus älterem *μαγαρο-ς* wie *ἑταιρος* aus *ἑταρο-ς*, *ὄνειρος* aus *ὄναρ* abgeleitet." These examples furnish analogy for the change of *a* to *ε* and of the metathesis of the *ι*. But it is thought that *πίσιρα* as a feminine to *πίων* is justified by the analogy of *πέπων*, *πέπειρα*, and that they are all to be referred to a group (cf. Mehlhorn Griech. Gram. 1845) of adjectives forming their feminines with the suffix *-ειρα*, to which are also referred *πρέσβυς*, *πρέσβειρα* and *ἱλαος*, *ἱλάειρα*. But there existed (date uncertain) a masculine *πέπειρος*, and *ἱλάειρα* is probably to be referred to *ἱλαρός* (vid. Lobeck Paralip. p. 210); hence, with the exception of *πρέσβυς*, none of this group of five can be quoted against the proposed theory, while some of them support it. But the metaplastic (?) nominatives *μάχαρος* (vid. Boeckh T. I. 449 b.) and *πιαρός* (cf. the adj. *φαρός* from *ψάρ*) can scarcely be more than illustrated by reference to the Sanskrit stem *pīvara*.

The existence, then, of an adjective form *πίαρ* parallel to *πίων* may be inferred:

1. From the interpretation of the two passages quoted.
2. From the testimony of Hesychius.
3. From the survival of the corresponding feminine form *πίσιρα*, supported by the analogy of *μάχαρ* and other words.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.

#### JE NE SACHE PAS.

Mr. Samuel Garner, in his remarks on *je ne sache pas*, in the second number of this Journal, gives his reasons why he does not believe *sache* in that phrase to be a subjunctive, and concludes with the words, "It is an indicative or it is nothing."

If this statement be correct, the phrase *je ne sache pas* ought to be equivalent to *je ne sais pas*; but whoever has observed how Frenchmen use the phrase in question, knows that such is not the case. I do not see any reason to doubt the correctness of Bescherelle's remark, that it is "une des nombreuses délicatesses" of the French language, or to differ from Mr. Littré when he says: "D'ailleurs le sens dénote un subjonctif plutôt qu'un indicatif; car *je ne sache pas* implique quelque chose de plus dubitatif que

*je ne sais pas*, et ce doute on l'explique en substituant le subjonctif à l'indicatif," etc.

If we admit this distinction universally felt and recognized by Frenchmen, the mere possibility that there may have been an old indicative *sache*, which would be phonetically derivable from *sapio*, is no strong proof that *sache* in the above phrase is the indicative. Mr. Littré, as I understand him, does not make "the assertion that *sache* from *sapio* is phonetically impossible," or "that *sache* is not derivable from *sapio*"; but he says: "L'explication (viz. that *sache* is the indicative) ne peut être admise, car *sapio* a donné *sai*; et *sache* vient de *sapiam*," which, I presume, means that the explanation cannot be considered of any value because we know that *sapio* has given *sai* (*sais*) and *sapiam*, *sache*, while we have nothing to show that *sapio* has given *sache*, although such might have been the case, (*sapius*, *sage*; *rubeus*, *rouge*).

On the other hand, if Mr. Garner terms Mr. Littré's explanation of *je ne sache pas* by means of a preceding expression such as *j'ose dire* "purely conjectural," I am inclined to think that he overlooked in Littré two quotations from one author (Paré, Dédicace au lecteur), and evidently having the same force, viz. *Aussi osé-je dire que je ne sache homme si chatouilleux, qui ne . . .* and: *Je ne sache homme si peu versé en astrologie, qui . . .* These sentences, which are found in Littré a dozen lines below the example from Rabelais also quoted by Mr. Garner, show that Mr. Littré's theory is not entirely *aus der Luft gegriffen*.

The uniqueness of the construction *je ne sache pas* does not seem to me very startling; if it is an isolated expression, it is so on account of the tense rather than the mood. Analogous sentences are common in various languages; in Latin we have *non dixerim*, etc. (in Greek the optative with *äv*), in German *ich dünkte*, *ich wüsste nicht*, etc. In these and similar expressions the subjunctive is used in place of the indicative, "to soften the positiveness of the assertion." For the same reason *je ne sache pas* (*ich wüsste nicht*) is used in place of *je ne sais pas* (*ich weiss nicht*).

In French too, the conditional (according to Diez, a tense of the subjunctive mood) of various verbs is used to express an affirmation doubtfully, e. g. *On dirait qu'il soit fou*; *j'aimerais mieux*; *je ne saurais vous le dire* (It. *non saprei*). The circumstance that *je ne saurais* received the meaning of *je ne puis*, *je ne peux*, may explain the use of the *present* tense in the case of *savoir*, especially because the use of *sache* and *saurais* seems to have originated about

the same period; we find also that before the conditional of *savoir* became equivalent to the present of *pouvoir*, *sauriez-vous* was used where one says now *sauriez-vous me dire*; as: *Sauriez-vous où demeure monsieur S.?* *Sauriez-vous me dire où demeure monsieur S.?* Further, the subordinate clause *que je sache* may have led to the use of *je ne sache pas* in the principal clause: *Ils n'ont pas étudié l'espagnol que je sache. Ont-ils étudié l'espagnol? Pas que je sache—Je ne sache pas qu'ils aient étudié l'espagnol.*

A special reason for softening assertions made with *savoir* is to be found in the meaning of this verb; it is easy to understand why a phrase like *je ne sache pas* should exist while a corresponding one with *croire* is wanting, since the latter verb itself implies uncertainty; and it will be observed that *je ne sache pas* occurs where the information of the speaker is necessarily only a partial one, and the evidence upon which the declaration is founded circumstantial. To say that "by using the subjunctive in the following clause sufficient indirectness or *délicatesse* may be secured," is making an assertion in the face of the undeniable fact that in the case of this verb French-speaking people feel the need of a still milder form of expression. In such sentences as *je ne crois pas qu'il vienne, non credo che venga*, it is not so much the subjunctive in the subordinate clause as the verb in the principal clause that makes the assertion doubtful; in English and German the indicative is the regular mood in this instance, and in Italian *che verrà* may take the place of *che venga*.

Concerning Mr. Garner's theory of an old French indicative *je sache*, etc., with which the imperative would correspond as in most other verbs, I would call attention to the Italian present indicative *so, sai, sapete*; pres. subj. *sappia, sappi, sappiate*; imperative *sappia, sappiate*. Here also the imperative has the forms of the subjunctive, while it has in other verbs those of the indicative. Are we to suppose that in Italian too a second form of the indicative existed, of which not a trace is left, as is the case with the hypothetical French indicative *sache*? Is not this exception attributable rather to the meaning of the verb, which does not admit of an imperative form in the same sense as the majority of verbs? We command a person *to go* or *learn*, but not with the same positiveness *to know*; do we not often translate such expressions as *wissen sie denn* or *sachez donc* by the potential or subjunctive?

A. LODEMAN.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Griechische Grammatik von GUSTAV MEYER. Leipzig, Breitkopf u. Härtel, 1880. 9 m. 50 pf.

A work which has been thought worthy of a place in the same series with Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar deserves something more than a mere book-notice, and the readers of this Journal may expect an elaborate review by a specialist ere long. Meantime it is fit that the appearance of Meyer's grammar should be announced with unusual emphasis, for the benefit of those who desire to acquaint themselves with the advance which certain sides of Greek study have been making in the last few years. Certain sides, for this Greek grammar comprises only Phonology and Inflection, a limitation which is sufficiently characteristic of recent tendencies. Of the 464 pages, 264 are taken up by the Phonology, and of these 264 no less than 148 are devoted to the vocalism, a proportion which is also highly significant. To some it will show nothing more than the ardor of a new love which will yield perhaps some day to the quieter balance of assured possession. To some it will be another summons to all except phonetists to give up all pretension to the style and title of grammarian. To all, whether they have occupied themselves more or less closely with the subject or not, it will be abundantly evident that a much sterner scientific process is to rule the future, and that the wisdom of many of our accepted textbooks is sheer foolishness. At the same time it is to be feared that many will refuse to learn one important lesson, which is the natural corollary of the advance which has been pushed forward with accelerated velocity in the last twenty years. Men will continue to embody in their practical teaching and their practical treatises the so-called 'certain results of comparative grammar,' regardless of the fate which has overtaken all such premature incorporations. The school grammar toils after the last number of 'Studien' or 'Beiträge' in vain, and the luckless compiler who tries to keep up with the times is in a constant ferment. Instead of making simple statements of fact which need not be repented of, every rule is tied to some theory, which may in a few years be cut away, so that our most acceptable school-grammars are masses of provisional hypotheses. 'Vorläufig vorzuziehen' may be well enough for Meyer, but elementary teaching to be successful must be dogmatic. Better no explanation than a doubtful one, and how many explanations have passed into that category in recent times! I have already hinted at the revolution in the study of vocalism, and the elaborate paper of the last number may serve to show the uninitiated what change would be required by recent research in certain fundamental rules which our boys continue to learn with unwavering faith. Or, to take an older instance, in the earlier editions of Curtius' grammar we were taught that 'the real ending  $\theta\iota$  in  $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\theta\iota$  is dropped and the stem vowel is lengthened to compensate for it,' and this doctrine is still laid down, years after Curtius him-



self declared that such a process was 'unerhört.' Hadley, even as early as 1860, is more guarded in his statements, but the new editor of his grammar will have many changes to make. Look at the miserable muddle into which we have all been plunged by the wretched device of the connecting vowel—a premature theory, which has so wrought itself into our practice that we are almost forced to retain it with a caveat. By and by 'thematic' may prove as troublesome, and processes that are now new may sorely plague the inventors. It is hardly to be hoped, however, that anybody will take warning, and while welcoming this new grammar as a valuable contribution to the scientific study of Greek, as well as an excellent index to the literature of the subject, it is with a certain dread lest all these theories be accepted as results available for the next elementary Greek grammar that is 'to mark an epoch in the study and teaching of Greek in America,' as all new grammars do—according to the publishers. Reserving detailed criticism for a later number of the *Journal*, I cannot for all that forbear to express my surprise that the author should have thought his *Phonology* complete without some theoretical exhibit of accent, which plays so important a part in modern phonetic research, as, indeed, might be gathered from the frequent references to it in this very book.

B. L. G.

---

A Latin Grammar for Schools. By HENRY JOHN ROBY. London, Macmillan & Co., 1880.

Mr. Roby's larger "Grammar of the Latin Language from Plautus to Suetonius" has been before the public several years (the first part reached a second edition in 1872), and has secured from scholars a very favorable recognition. Mr. Roby has distinguished himself over most English makers of Latin grammars by the care which he has bestowed upon the question of pronunciation and the principles of phonetic change, as well as by a somewhat independent arrangement of materials to illustrate the facts of the language on the side of Word-Formation and Syntax. A grammar by the same editor intended for schools may, therefore, well excite the interest of teachers. What the name school-grammar implies is not at once clear. If it means a book to be put into the hands of eleven-year-old boys to be their guide until they enter the university, then Mr. Roby's work fails, in being for beginners too technical and abstruse, and in not making clear type-distinctions between the more and the less important matters. If, on the other hand, its aim is to state clearly the facts and principles of the language for advanced pupils, with such scientific accuracy that they shall not have to spend time at the university in unlearning them, then Mr. Roby's grammar is sadly disappointing. We regret indeed that the work before us is, as he states in his preface, in the main simply an abridgment of his larger grammar, for science has made some advances even within the last ten years, and a general recasting might have secured greater accuracy of statement as well as greater perspicuity. The work is divided into four parts. Book I treats of Sounds; Book II of Inflexions; Book III of Word-formation; Book IV of Syntax. The rear is brought up by a large amount of useful information contained in seven appendices, viz: A—Money, Measures, Weights; B—Divisions of Time, etc.; C—Names of Relations D—Terms of

Latin Metre; E—Grammatical and Rhetorical Terms; F—Principal (extant) Latin Authors; G—Abbreviations.

The valuable preface of the larger grammar is of course omitted. The description of sounds is in the main clear, though many will decline to pronounce *ae* as *a* in *hat* lengthened, and not a few we fear will fail to hit at first trial the sound (given for *œ*) intermediate between *oi* in *boil* and *ei* in *feint*. The illustrations of phonetic laws are at times not very happy, e. g. § 23 we read, "If the consonant is omitted altogether the preceding vowel is often lengthened," among the examples *caementum* for *caed-mentum*, *jū-dex* for *jus-dex*, *trāmitto* for *transmitto*. Is not *a* before *ns* in *trans* long? Is *u* in *jūs* short?

§ 35 reads "*a* in suffixes becomes *u* before *l*, *e* before *r* or *ll*, and *i* before other single consonants"; e. g. *cāsa*, *cāsula* (sic) etc., *Allia*, *Alliensis*.

§ 31 (d). "By transposition (?) *ār*, *ēr* (which is often for *ir*), etc., become *rā*, *rē*, *rī*," etc. One example given is *sūpēr-īmus* (*supermus*), *suprēmus*.

The lessons of the Sanskrit vowel *r̥* are as sadly lost sight of in § 39, where the statement is made that *ē* before *r* is often omitted, e. g. *ācēr*, *ācris*; *āgēr*, *āgrum*, cf. also § 109 and § 128.

In § 50 Mr. Roby says "*i*+*i* if one be long gives *i*; if both are short, *ī*; e. g. *fugi-is*, *fugis*; *egregi-ior*, *egregior*; *navi-ibus*, *navibus*." But on the very next page § 52, 2, he says, "All vowels which have originated from contraction are long"; under which rule the last example is *tibicen* for *tibicen*. In § 43, too, he gives *nihil*, *nīl*. Does the second *i* of *nihil* have the *i* long of *hilum*? One sees that the rule is manufactured for Mr. Roby's express use, to bolster up false theories of formation.

It is high time that makers of Latin grammars should mark the natural quantity of vowels wherever known, in syllables long by position. Mr. Roby rarely ventures to do this. However, we read, § 62, 2, "[The vowel itself is short in *auspēx*, long in *regēnt*]." Is the quantity in the latter word perfectly certain? We grant that the analogy of the other forms *regēmus*, *regētis* and the formation itself point that way, but the *ē* of the third s. *regēt* has become short, and we know that short vowels prevail before *nt* and *nd* in Latin, so in terminations *-entia*, *-endum*, *-entem*, cf. Foerster Rhein. Mus., Vol. 33, p. 297, and Schmitz Beiträge zur Lat. Sprach- und Literaturkunde, pp. 6, 11, 14, 32; cf. M̄P̄C̄NTI apud Mommsen, I. R. N. n. 2143, although the *e* in the nom. before *-ns* is of course long. We only ask Mr. Roby for like proof of the *ē* in *regēnt*.

In § 72 he shifts upon the Roman grammarians the responsibility for the old rule about enclitics causing the accent to fall on the last syllable of the word to which they are attached. At the end of § 76 he, however, expresses doubt as to the truth of this doctrine. He might better have quoted the brief summary of Schoell's investigation, "De Accentu Linguae Latinae," Leipzig, 1875, given in Bouterwek & Tegge's "Altsprachliche Orthoepie," p. 20 ff, according to which we must accent *hicine*, *plērāque*, but *mihī met*, *limindque*, etc.

In Book II much confusion results from Mr. Roby's loose use of the word stem. For him it includes root, base-form and stem proper, and the term root is employed but rarely. In § 78 he says that from the stem *bon* we have *bon-us*, a good he; *bona*, a good she; *bonum*, a good thing. In § 81 a common stem *serv-*, denoting slave, is said to become *servo-* for male slave, *serva-* for female slave. In § 353 stems in *-vo* are classed under the head of Labial Noun-stems. In § 84 they are properly called *-o* stems.

We are not surprised to find in § 123 the acc. ending of *-i* stems given as *-em* or *-im* (for *i-em*), the Abl. s. as *-ē* or *-ī* (for *i-ed*), and the Dat. Loc. Abl. pl. as *-ibus* (for *i-ibus*), since Mr. Roby had carefully prepared us for this in § 50.

The catalogue of similar sins might be extended. Yet this part of the grammar has been done with evident care, and the analysis of *-i* and consonant stems, § 132, is new and interesting. We think the statement, that in consonant stems the final stem consonant is always preceded by a vowel, should be qualified; cf. stems *cord-*, *mell-*, *farr-*, *fell-*, etc. Nor can we see why, § 145, *rōbur* is called an *-r* stem (cf. *rōbus* Cato, and *rōbustus*), while *ōnus* is called a stem in *-us*.

In § 209 the fact is mentioned that *quisque* is used of a woman in Plautus, but that the interrogative *quis* is also used for *quae* we are nowhere told.

In § 238 Latin verbs are said to have inflexions to denote differences of voice, person, number, mood and tense. Which one of these things, pray, is denoted by the *n* in *pungo*, *punctus*, which in § 78 is (improperly) called an inflexion inserted in the middle of the stem? We have no desire to criticize severely Mr. Roby's peculiar views of tense and mood formation. The subject is beset with difficulties, and it is easier to tear down old theories than to build up satisfactory new ones. We hope that the "jung grammatiker" in Germany will some day clear away the mist. Of the *s* in the second pers. s. and pl. Perf. Ind. it may be said that no man knoweth whence it cometh, and Mr. Roby is only half in earnest when in § 304 he tries to persuade us that the suffix *-is* was once added throughout the perfect, the *s* having later been lost in the first and third s. and in the first pl.

The alphabetical list of verbs on pages 134-153 is very useful though incomplete, and showing in the assumed stems much of the same inconsistency already remarked, e. g. If *torse-* is the stem of *torreo*, then with equal right *terse-* is the stem of *terreo* (cf. *tristis*) and *vers-* not *verr-*—of *verro*.

Of typographical errors we have noted the following:

§ 35, *cāsula* for *cūsula*. § 112, *Claudii* for *Claudie*. § 147 (2), *Cerēs* for *Cerēs*. § 175, *ēgēnus* for *ēgēnus*. § 228, *tāmen* for *tāmen*. § 295, *nūbere* for *nūbere*. § 295, *pīg-* for *pīg-* (cf. § 329). § 311, *vād-* for *vād-*. § 315, *flōrē-* for *flōrē-*. P. 151, *invādēre* for *invādēre*. § 377, *sācērulum* for *sācērulum*.

In Book IV the absence of historical method is the most conspicuous fault; e. g. there is no hint of the development of *quom* clauses, nor of the later use of *quamquam* with the Subjunctive and with Participles. We might proceed to point out many excellent features and some defects, sed longum est ea dicere.

MINTON WARREN.

---

The Odyssey of Homer done into English Prose. By S. H. BUTCHER and A. LANG. Second Edition, revised and corrected, with additional Notes. London, Macmillan and Co., 1879.

It was my fortune some years ago to deliver a course of lectures on the Odyssey before an audience few of whom could read the original. As may be imagined, the question of illustrative translation was not the least troublesome, and while I tried to derive some advantage from a comparison of the various renderings, I longed for some good prose version that would at all events present what Villemain calls a plaster-cast of the great epic, and for my

immediate purpose I would gladly have given up the quaint embroidery of Chapman, the splendid artificiality of Pope, the reflective calm of Bryant, and even the 'lush' sweetness of Worsley, and all the lessons that might be drawn from these partial versions, for such a translation as the one for which the English-speaking lovers of Homer have to thank Messrs. Butcher and Lang. In their modest preface these accomplished scholars say, and say truly, that of Homer there can be no final translation, but for many years there will be no prose version that can rival this, and a new edition following so soon on the first shows that their good work has not lacked recognition. A detailed criticism of the book itself would be too late as well as unprofitable here. My present object is to call attention to some additions which enrich the new issue.

The translators have prefixed to this edition an introduction giving their views of the composition and plot of the *Odyssey*. As is almost inevitable with any one who works lovingly at the reproduction of the *Odyssey*, they believe in the unity of the poem. "The composition is elaborate and artistic, the threads of the plot are skilfully separated and combined. The whole is surrounded with the atmosphere of the kingly age of Greece, and the result is the *Odyssey*, with that unity of plot and variety of character which must have been given by one masterly constructive genius. The date at which the poet of the *Odyssey* lived may be approximately determined by his consistent description of a peculiar and definite condition of society which had ceased to exist in the ninth century B. C., and of a stage of art in which Phoenician and Assyrian influences dominated."

Of the new notes there is one of some length on 1, 349, in which K. F. Hermann's view of ἀλφειστής is maintained, that the word means 'bread-eater'; 3, 162, ἀμφιέλισσαι = *recurvatae*, 'with a curved beak at either extremity raised high out of the water,' illustrated by a picture from the reliefs at Medinet Habou (see also Mr. Merriam's *Phaeacians* noticed elsewhere, 6, 264). On 3, 378, there is an inconclusive note on Τριτογένεια which could not have been other than inconclusive. On the word ἄωρος, occurring in the description of Scylla (12, 89), Mr. D. B. Monro is represented as pointing out "the philological objection to the combination αω where we should expect either εω as in μετέωρος or ηω as in ἀπῆωρος (*Od.* 12, 435)." He would therefore take ἄωρος in the usual sense 'unripe,' 'unformed,' and see a contrast between the dwarfed feet and the great growth of neck, the contrast being made by ἡ τοι . . . δέ τοι—compare line 86:

τῆς ἡ τοι φωνὴ μὲν ὅση σκύλακος νεογιλῆς  
γίγνεται, αὐτὴ δ' αὖτε πέλωρ κακόν.

The editors conceive that this would give a very satisfactory sense to the passage, but very properly say that the philological objection is not decisive against the commonly accepted version 'dangling.'

There is a note of much interest on 19, 578, in which the editors discuss Goebel's plausible suggestion that the axes resembled in shape our double battle-axes, and that the archer shot through the opening at the top, which almost forms a ring. It is contended that πρώτης in juxtaposition with πάντων would naturally mean the first of the row, not the outermost tip of the handle,



21, 422 [= ἀκρὸς στελεειῆς], and in this sense the translators take it, 'beginning from the first axe handle,' and say that the genitive is an 'ablative genitive, not uncommon in Homer,' though they would find it hard to parallel such an ablative use as this. They further urge that we are not acquainted with any examples of ancient Greek axes like that drawn by Goebel. Schliemann's double-headed axes are hammer-headed. Then comes the difficulty of shooting through the handle hole, whether by a standing (19, 575) or a seated archer (21, 420). The problem is to find an ancient axe through a hole in the metal of which it was possible to shoot. Egyptian axes with open-work blades are then adduced and figured, and finally there is a drawing of an axe the head of which, re-curved against the handle, forms a ring, which might answer the conditions of the Odyssean trial. Such an axe is wielded by an Amazon in a conflict with Herakles, as represented on a metope of a temple at Selinus. The last new note pertains to Homeric burial.

B. L. G.

---

The Phaeacian Episode of the Odyssey, as comprised in the sixth, seventh, eighth, eleventh and thirteenth books: with Introduction, Notes and Appendix. By AUGUSTUS C. MERRIAM, Ph. D., Columbia College. Harper & Brothers, 1880.

Mr. Merriam's edition of the 'Phaeacians of Homer' does not belong to the ordinary run of school-books, and it would have been better, if he had frankly renounced any attempt to combine the requisites of a work for beginners with elaborate expositions which would be suitable only in a special discussion of the unity of the Odyssey. It is strangely incongruous to find a long glorification of Odysseus' address to Nausikaa followed by the elementary question: What parts of *eipi* are regularly enclitic? It is fair to say, however, that Mr. Merriam, as is shown by his preface, is firmly convinced that his method is right, and that he seems to hold himself distinctly responsible for much that would seem unpractical or undesirable; and as no one can follow him in his appeals to his personal experience as a teacher, it may be supposed that he has good warrant for the fulness of his archaeological notes, the prolixity of his aesthetic discussions and the apparent irrelevancy of many of his remarks. Still it is not to be doubted that Mr. Merriam's experience as an editor will check his tendency as a teacher to exuberance, and it is certainly to be hoped that a man who has shown ability both to work hard and to work independently, will not stop short of the great virtue of self-limitation. The introduction gives an outline of the Homeric Question—which is rather scant toward the close—and the appendix sets forth the discoveries of Schliemann and Cesnola, which have furnished the editor with many illustrations of the text. In the notes there are several elaborate discussions of syntactical points, as notably 8, 564, on the time of the aorist participle; but generally Mr. Merriam is content with a reference to Hadley or Goodwin or Curtius, even in instances in which these text-books are inadequate or misleading. He has also adopted the irritating, and in my judgment unfruitful, practice of interspersing grammatical questions for the purpose of stimulating the attention of the young student. In quotations from Gladstone, Mure and Hayman Mr. Merriam has been liberal, and there are many long passages from Homer printed in full with translations following; but



Mr. Merriam's original notes are copious, and show that he has bestowed much thought on the ethics and aesthetics of Homer under the strong impulse of conservative convictions. The style is too diffuse and rhetorical, and there is scarcely a page that would not gain by severe compression. The word for word translations are too numerous, and at best are rather quaint than happy. As a sympathetic editor, which is the highest praise known to modern criticism, Mr. Merriam is often a victim to the sin of over-interpretation, and puts more into moods and tenses than moods and tenses will well bear. But the book is the result of much honest work, shows a long and loving acquaintance with the subject, and in these days of slight and perfunctory adaptations of foreign results, is not to be dismissed without a hearty appreciation of the zeal and diligence which make Mr. Merriam's Phaeacians an exceptional production.

B. L. G.

---

The Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews, translated and critically examined by MICHAEL HEILPRIN. Vols. I, II. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

The object in making a special collection and examination of the historical poetry of a people may be a literary one, to expound the poets and inquire into their mode of using history; or a scientific-historical one, to glean from them additions to our historical knowledge, facts not mentioned in the historical writings proper, and especially the tone and coloring of the poet's own time. Sometimes the historical references are plain, as occasionally in Aeschylus; but where the poetry is relatively early and full of legend, the attempt to extract the historical kernel is a difficult one, as in Buddhist religious romances, and in the later recensions of the Lay of the Nibelungen. In the old Israelitish literature we might suppose that this historical element in the poetry would be of special value, from the peculiar way in which the historical books are written. Such of this class as we now have were not only produced some time after the events described in them, but had their origin in the desire, not so much to give a literally exact picture of the times treated, as to make them teach a religious lesson; and this paraenetic motive, together with the absence of scientific-historical feeling, led the writers to omit much matter that seemed to them irrelevant to their object, and to give to former times the coloring of their own. With the poets and prophets it was different; their object was more frequently either simply to chronicle facts or traditions, or to draw from them some general ethical lesson. If, then, there should exist any very early poetry, it might contain important historical statements and allusions not found elsewhere; or, if it were not more ancient than the trustworthy sources of the historical books, it might mention facts that they omit, especially features of the social life and popular modes of thought and traditions, and might yield valuable historical results to a critical examination such as Mr. Heilprin proposes to make in the work above-mentioned, of which the first two volumes have appeared.

Mr. Heilprin's special aim seems to be the historical one, as we judge from the fact that he treats his material by periods, collecting and examining together, for example, all the poetry that relates to the exodus, then all that makes mention of David, and so of succeeding periods. This plan, however, has little or no historical advantage for the time preceding Samuel, for, according to the

author's view, the poetical pieces referring to this early time were all written much later, and really give the history of their own time; thus, when we come to the Jacob-blessing, Gen. xlix, we find that we are studying not the patriarchal period, but the reign of Jeroboam I; and the Balaam-prophecy, Numb. xxiv, xxv, enlightens us in respect to the Assyrian period or a later one, but tells nothing of the Amorite conquest of Moses. From the historical point of view it would be better to put each poem in the historical place in which it belongs, when this is possible. On the other hand, some advantage is gained by contrasting the state of things described in the poetical piece with what may be gathered from other sources to have been the real social and political situation; and further, the difficulty of assigning precise dates may be a reason for adopting in the early pieces the order in which they occur in the Old Testament rather than attempting to weave them into the history in their proper places. The first volume ends with a discussion of David's claims to the authorship of psalms; the second begins with pieces relating to David and Solomon and ends with Hosea, being almost entirely taken up with the examination of a portion of Micah, Isa. xv, xvi, Amos and Hosea. The connecting history between the various pieces is given in tolerably full outline, there is a new translation of the text with footnotes, and longer notes are placed at the end of the volume.

The author's critical standpoint and method is in general that of the Dutch school, though in some cases he agrees with writers who go beyond Kuenen in lowering dates and recognizing petty political motives in the composition of historical and historical-poetical pieces; with Bernstein's theory of the genesis of the patriarchal history, for example, which is that the legends of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob grew up around the three holy places, Hebron, Beersheba and Bethel respectively; Isaac, the oldest, the patriarch of Simeon, having been early almost entirely merged into Abraham, the hero of the powerful tribe of Judah, while Jacob remained connected with Ephraim; that the writers of each of the two great sections of the country in the early monarchy praised their own and vilified the ancestor of the other; and that, finally, as a national feeling grew up, these various bright and dark pictures were harmonized into the present history. Genesis xxxviii Bernstein regards as a venomous Ephraimite veiled satire on the scandals in the family of David narrated in II Sam. xi ff; Judah is David himself; his wife, the daughter of the Canaanite Shua, that is Bathshua, is Bathsheba (called Bath-shua in I Chr. iii 5); two of his sons die for their wickedness, as two of David's died (Er is by transposition Ra="wicked," and Onan is Amnon); Shela is Shelomo (Solomon), and the daughter-in-law Tamar is David's unfortunate daughter. This theory is wrought out by its author with great ingenuity, but there are, as Mr. Heilprin remarks, difficulties in it. We should hardly expect at that time (during or soon after the reign of Jeroboam I) so elaborately worked up a fiction, or such ingenuity in veiling names and occurrences, and we should expect, if the attempt at satire were made, more point in the allusions; we should suppose, for example, that Bathsheba would not go unscathed (whereas the Bathshua of Genesis seems to be a very respectable person), that Solomon (a special enemy of Jeroboam) would be more sharply dealt with, and that there would be some more obvious allusion to Absalom. And why go to the trouble of making this rather obscure fiction when the whole history of David's household must have been known at that time? That it was

known is clear from the book of Samuel. A still more serious objection to Bernstein's theory is that this elaborate hitting and counter-hitting is not in accordance with what we find to be the mode of growth of legends among the Israelites and elsewhere. These stories of the forefathers no doubt grew up in different localities, and sometimes contradict one another; but, though we may not be able in all cases to give a satisfactory account of their origin, it seems more reasonable to suppose that they were natural products of popular tradition than that they were elaborately concocted defamatory fictions. Mr. Heilprin adopts this latter explanation of the Jacob-blessing, Gen. xlix, which he regards, with Bernstein, as a Jeroboamic production written for the purpose of extolling Ephraim and justifying the defection of the Ten Tribes, and which therefore heaps abuse on the southern tribes and Reuben, which probably claimed precedence over Joseph; and the stories in Genesis of the wickedness of Reuben, Simeon and Levi are then to be regarded as fictions invented about the same time by the same persons. But what, then, of the praise so cordially bestowed on Judah? Bernstein's explanation that this could not be well avoided, seeing that Judah was in fact at that time a well-established kingdom, is hardly satisfactory; surely that need not have prevented the ingenious author's inventing some sharp defamation—which, however, we do not find, for we cannot hold, with Heilprin, that the "eyes red with wine" is introduced as a censure; yet we should not, on critical grounds, object to Bernstein's transference of a part of Judah's blessing to Joseph, if he thereby obtained a satisfactory result. We can as little accept the explanation of the "until he come to Shiloh," which sees in it a reference to the gathering at Shechem (supposed to be practically the same as Shiloh), where, in the person of Rehoboam, the Judah-dynasty lost the control of the northern tribes, and which supposes an allusion to the prophet Ahijah the Shilonite's meeting with Rehoboam; for, to give no other reason, the writer of the blessing knew that, in spite of the defection, Judah still retained the sceptre. This poem may be an Ephraimitic production, but its utterances on the several tribes are rather attempts to characterize them according to their then existing condition, and to explain this condition by the old legends, than to invent laudatory and defamatory legends in the interests of the new government of Jeroboam.

While in this case our author seems to have gone beyond just critical limits, elsewhere his critical remarks are better supported, as in his treatment of the Song of Miriam, Gen. xv, the Balaam-prophecies, Numb. xxiv, xxv, the Moses-blessing, Dt. xxxiii, and the Song of Songs. The difficulty that he finds in referring the Song of Deborah, Numb. v, to the period of the Judges may be in great measure removed by supposing its present form to be a later recension of an early poem; this would account for the poetical finish and Aramaisms, while it would give due weight to the natural lyric *abandon* and the wild, half-savage exultation over fallen enemies and concentrated bitterness against lukewarm friends, which breathes the very spirit of the fierce times of the early Judges.

In Vol. II, p. 23 ff, he has attempted to put together from Micah the prophecies of the Micaiah of I Kings xxii, supposed to have been adopted by the later prophet; but this is hardly more than a critical *jeu d'esprit*. So on p. 134 of the same volume the grounds for finding in Hosea numerous allusions to Eli's family do not seem to be convincing. In general, however, Mr. Heilprin's

dealing with critical questions is careful and, as it appears to us, sound. A valuable feature of this part of his work is the fullness with which he gives the views of modern critics, Ewald, Bernstein, Seinecke, Kuenen, Hitzig, Fürst, Grätz and others, always, however, maintaining the position of an independent inquirer; see, for example, his note, II 165, on Grätz's citation of Greek words in the Song of Songs. It must be added also, that, with all his critical freeness and what we must regard as his occasional transgression of critical bounds, he deals reverently with the religious thought of the Old Testament; his remarks on the lofty monotheism of Amos, II 109 ff, are as earnest and vigorous as they are just.

The grammatical and exegetical work of our author is always well considered; he has diligently used the latest books on the subjects treated, and also states some noteworthy views which he has got from unpublished and oral sources. At the outset, in remarking on the Song of Lamech, he ventures on the perilous ground of comparative mythology by bringing together Tubal-Cain and Vulcan, Yabal and Apollo, Naamah and Venus, an identification that has found favor with other writers, but seems to have no ground to rest on. The resemblance of the words amounts to nothing when we consider that we are ignorant of the origin and history of the names in Genesis, as well as the Vulcan and Apollo—for through what changes from their original forms may they not have passed?—and the points of agreement between the characters are of too general a nature and too common among ancient peoples to constitute an argument for identity. The same thing must be said of the supposed connection between Europa and Heb. *ereb*, "evening"; nor does there seem to be any probability in the opinion that Caphtor is Heb. *kephthor*, "the shore of the bull" (a compound not in keeping with Semitic usage), II 194, 196.

Among the grammatical points to which we must take exception are the following: In the first volume, p. 40, "dishonoring him who rested on my couch" is a possible rendering, but forced; 41, the translation "kindness" is contrary to the parallelism and the connection—the "self-will" of the Eng. Auth. Version is better, the word *raḡon* here meaning "arbitrary and unscrupulous carrying out of one's designs," as in Dan. viii 4; 63, "mortified," instead of "angered," is an inappropriate expression; 83, the connection favors "enchantment against" instead of "in," comp. Numb. xxiii 8; 144, "battle-brook," instead of "ancient brook," is hardly philologically supported; 230, the explanation of *sh'ṇayim*, "two," as = *asht' ṇayim*, "two ones," the dual of *ashtin*, "one," is impossible—the letters Ayin and *t* are fatal to such a derivation, and in the feminine *shṭayim* the *t* is the feminine sign; but the meaning "two sevens" for *shibathayim*, Gen. iv 24, is probably correct; 235, nothing is gained by rendering *yikḡah* "wrinkles" instead of "obedience," Prov. xxx 17, and there cannot be said to be any philological authority for the former. In the second volume, p. 84, the translation "it [death] is not to be mentioned [I adjure you] by Jehovah's name" is grammatically improbable; 136, Hos. iv 18, the rendering "they love O give" is too difficult to be acceptable, in spite of the reduplicated form in Hos. viii 13, or rather this latter favors reading *ahabhabu* as one word = "they love"; 139, "grand king" for *melek yareb* seems to have nothing in its favor; 149, Hos. ix 2-6, the verbs should be future rather than present; 154, "sons of Alvah" instead of "sons of iniquity" is improbable. On the other

hand, I 146, the rendering "vulture-ornament" instead of "maiden," communicated to the author by Rappoport, is ingenious—the connection requires some such sense, though whether this one it is hard to say. II 201, the interpretation of *alukah*, Prov. xxx 15, as the name of the author of the proverb, instead of "horse-leech," seems probable, though the other changes in the translation do not especially commend themselves; Mr. Heilprin states that he got this interpretation of *alukah* from his father, who, we judge, was a man of learning and scholarly ability.

Having noted these few points in which we think our author to be in error, we are glad to be able to say that his two volumes are full of good material, which he has collected with industry and used with judgment; we welcome this critical study of Old Testament literature, and trust that Mr. Heilprin will continue his work. We may add that his English style is excellent, and that the mechanical execution of the books is admirable.

C. H. TOY.

---

A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey and Hymns of Homer, to which is added a Concordance to the Parallel Passages in the Iliad, Odyssey and Hymns. By HENRY DUNBAR, M. D. Oxford: Clarendon Press. New York: Macmillan & Co. Baltimore: Cushings & Bailey. (\$5.25.)

This is one of those works of 'long breath' in which Scotch tenacity holds its own against German perseverance. The task, as conceived by Dr. Dunbar, is almost purely mechanical; the verbs are cited by the initial letter of the form and not by that of the stem; for *ἐπέλασσε* we must look under E and not under II, and so far the difficulty of using the book for purposes of research is enhanced; particles are excluded; even the prepositions are not registered; and the availability of the book is rather on the literary than on the strictly scientific side of philology. The accuracy I have not been able to submit to any series of searching tests, but, so far as I can judge, the concordance will answer every reasonable demand for ready reference. In the preface the author, who has deserved so well of the lovers of Homer, excuses himself for 'whatever omissions or misplaced accents, breathings, or iotas subscript may be met with,' by the statement that 'the writing of one thousand five hundred and sixty pages or above sixty-two thousand four hundred lines of closely written Greek MS. has somewhat weakened and impaired his eyesight.' Certainly this would disarm the harshest critic, and give every one additional occasion to rejoice that Mr. Gladstone has bestowed some substantial recognition of this great service on the much-enduring hero of Boscobel. At the same time, in view of the notorious difficulty of getting Greek correctly printed, the most natural plan would have been to cut up the requisite number of texts, and to have made the work not so much a matter of eyesight as of scissors and paste. Twelve copies of the Odyssey would have sufficed for the purpose, allowing as many as six concordance words to the line; but perhaps the compiler felt a reverence toward the outside of the divine poem such as all theological students do not show toward the printed Bible, and there is a loving persistency about the work which would otherwise have been lost.

B. L. G.



Sammlung Kurzer Grammatiken Germanischer Dialecte. I.—Gotische Grammatik mit einigen Lesestücken und Wortverzeichnis von W. BRAUNE. Halle, 1880.

Every one who has tried to acquire Gothic himself or to teach it, from Grimm, Heyne, or any of the smaller grammars, will welcome this book. The truth is Heyne's *Ulfila* has grown worse and worse with each new edition, certainly the grammar part of it. Braune's grammar is intended for private study and as a basis for lectures. That the phonology and 'flexionslehre' embody the latest results in Indo-European and Germanic philology it is hardly necessary to state, since the author had a hand in shaping these. The grammar is clear, practical and concise. The treatment of *a* and *u* is not so good as of *i*. What he says in the preface about *a* and *o* might have been put into § 4. There is not a word about syntax. The reading includes chapters from Matthew, Mark, Luke, from II Corinthians, and Leaf VIII of the *Skeireins* on John vi 9-13.

Those who are acquainted with the glossary of Braune's Old High German Reader, which has some objectionable features of arrangement, will not be surprised to find that in this glossary verbs compounded with prefixes and prepositional adverbs are put under the single verbs, even when these occur only in compounds. Look down a column of *th*'s and the eye is annoyed by three *ga*'s and one *us*-. '*Gataura*' being a noun stands under *g*, where it belongs. There the beginner is told '*siehe gatairan*,' which, however, means 'see not *gatairan*' but '*tairan*,' though this never occurs in his reading. The vocabulary would also be improved if with strong verbs the ablaut-series were indicated by a number after '*st. v.*' or by the paragraph. The promised Old High German Grammar by the same author and the Middle High German by Paul can come none too soon.

H. C. G. BRANDT.

Weinkauff. De Tacito Dialogi Auctore. Coloniae Agripp. Roemke. 1881.

The *Abhandlung* of which this is the second edition appeared first in two *programs* of the Friedr. Wilh. Gymnasium at Cologne for the years 1857 and 1859. It was welcomed at once as a valuable contribution to the settlement of the long-vexed question as to the authorship of the so-called *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, less however from any brilliant display of critical insight or happy combination than for its painstaking collection of the materials necessary for forming a final judgment. As it has long been out of print, a positive want is met by its republication. In the body of the Latin Dissertation, which covers only thirty-six pages, no changes have been made, though a few footnotes have been added. In the indices, however, to the rhetorical and grammatical peculiarities, as well as to the Latinity of the *Dialogus* compared with the admitted works of Tacitus, numerous important additions have been made, so that the revised edition has a new value. Moreover, in the German preface of one hundred and seventy pages, a full and interesting account is given of the various stages of the controversy, from its origin down to the present day.

Supporting the claim of Tacitus we find the names of Scaliger, Dodwell, Niebuhr, Peerlkamp, Döderlein, Orelli, Teuffel, Ritter, Thiersch, Nipperdey, Hübner, Wölfflin and Mommsen, while the list of eminent scholars arrayed

against it is almost as long. It begins with the first German editor of the *Dialogus*, Beatus Rhenanus (Basel, 1519), and includes Justus Lipsius, Joh. Ger. Vossius, Fr. August Wolf, Eichstadt, Bernhardy and Sauppe. Some, as is well known, were inclined to assign the work to Pliny or Quintilian. The arguments *pro* and *con* receive careful attention, and due weight is attached to Adolph Lange's discovery, as early as 1803, of the correspondence between Pliny Epp. ix. 10, *inter nemora et lucos*, etc., and Dial. c. 9 and c. 12. Weinkauff insists upon an early date of composition, vigorously opposing those who would set it after Maternus' death in 91, or even after the close of Domitian's reign. His arguments seem to us conclusive. Tacitus wrote the work, if at all, as a young man, and the difference in style between it and the *Agricola* is surely not greater than between Carlyle's *Life of Schiller* and his *Sartor Resartus*. One could wish that Weinkauff himself had imitated the brevity of Tacitus' later works rather than the redundancy of the *Dialogue* in his description of the author's plan and purpose, and surely those interested in so difficult a question will regard the coaching on the life and character of the younger Pliny as quite gratuitous. Pages cxxxvii-clxx contain a useful summary of Tacitean peculiarities, which needs however to be supplemented by the treatises of Draeger and Wölfflin. Finally, the Indices, p. 38-292, embracing synonyms, hendiadys, etc., rhetorical figures, syntactical usage, Latinity, though not by any means exhaustive, constitute the most valuable feature of the work.

MINTON WARREN.

Lecturas de Clase, escogidas de autores españoles que hoy viven, colleccionadas y anotadas por D. GUILLERMO I. KNAPP, pp. iv+120. New Haven, Peck; New York, Christern, 1880.

This unpretentious little work contains five prose-extracts from Spanish authors of to-day, among whom we notice the familiar names of Cánovas del Castillo and Juan Valera. The whole amounts to only ninety-five pages of text, of which the introductory selection, a short one-act comedy, is a fair specimen of what one could see any evening on the boards of Madrid, where two or three like productions are often represented in as many hours to the intensely theatre-loving *Madrileños*. The pieces that follow are well chosen, but unfortunately are much too short to give the student any adequate idea of the extent or variety of the modern Spanish vocabulary.

A list of words for the comedy, with a supplementary one to the other articles, and five pages of notes to the entire work, are added as helps to an understanding of the different texts.

It is much to be regretted that Professor Knapp has not given us here both longer selections and more of them. He has cut himself loose from the traditional classicism so common in such manuals, and in this respect his *Lecturas* is a step in the right direction. They introduce the reader to the fresh, living thought of regenerated Spain, but they do not give him a chance to become acquainted with its extraordinary development.

A. M. E.

## REPORTS.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. VIII, Part I.

The first twenty pages of this part are occupied by Cobet with critical remarks upon Eunapius, in *Vitis Sophistarum et fragmentis Historiarum*. These notes do not contain much of general interest. One or two extracts may be made, however, which will show Cobet's opinion of Eunapius as regards style and trustworthiness.

"P. 67. Laudat Hilarium κατὰ γραφικὴν φιλοσοφήσαντα ὥστε οὐκ ἐτελνῆκει ἐν ταῖς ἐκείνου χερσὶν ὁ Εὐφράνωρ. Est operae pretium in his animadvertere obscurum et atrum dicendi genus, ex qua caligine vix sententia pellucet haec: '*in pictura ita versatus est ut per eius manus Euphranor adhuc superesse videretur*,' ut optime Gatakerus interpretatur apud Boisson. Quod Dionysius Halic. Tom. VI, p. 759, de Platone dicit: ὅταν εἰς τὴν περιττολογίαν καὶ τὸ καλλιπεῖν—ἀμετρον ὁρμὴν λάβῃ—μελαίνει τὸ σαφὲς καὶ ζόφῳ ποιεῖ παραπλήσιον, aliquanto verius et iustius de Eunapio diceretur, in quem quadrat quod ipse de Iamblichō scripsit, p. 12. οὐ κατέχει τὸν ἀκροατὴν—ἀλλ' ἀποστρέφειν καὶ ἀποκναίνει τὴν ἀκοὴν εἰκεν'."

"P. 98. De Libanio scribit: πᾶς τις αὐτῶν τὰ σφέτερα θαυμάζειν ᾤετο· οὕτω πολὺμορφόν τι χρῆμα καὶ ἀλλοπρόσαλλον ἦν. Scrib. πᾶς τις αὐτὸν τὰ σφέτερα θαυμάζειν ᾤετο, ut paullo ante: ὁ μὲν πόλῳ πονος λῆρος ἡλέγχετο, τῶν δὲ συγγιγνομένων ἐκαστος ἄλλον ἑαυτὸν ὁρᾶν ὑπελάμβανεν. Vide autem mihi mirifice compositam orationem: ὁ πόλῳ πονος est a Theognide, πολὺμορφόν τι χρῆμα Herodoteum est et ἀλλοπρόσαλλος Homeri. Atque his admiscuit sordidum et plebeium τὰ σφέτερα de uno pro τὰ ἑαυτοῦ. Caeterum de Libanii ingenio et moribus nihil opus est Eunapio credere. Palam est enim in nonnullis mentiri Eunapium."

S. A. Naber has thirty-five pages devoted to the criticism of the comic fragments. A specimen or two of his suggestions may be given.

In the third line of Cratinus, Ἀρχιλοχοὶ fr. 3, οὐ μέντοι παρὰ κωφὸν ὁ τυφλὸς εἰκοι λαλῆσαι he proposes εἰκοι ἀποπαρδεῖν, saying: 'caecus est qui se solum esse arbitratur; venter crepat, nec suspicatur se cuiquam facere contumeliam, qualem Amasis rex apud Herodotum sciens facit; adest autem mutus qui non sentit sibi contumeliam fieri, itaque miro casu fit iniuria quam nemo infert et nemo patitur.' [ἀποπαρδεῖν is an heroic remedy. Why not λακῆσαι? B. L. G.]

Frag. 13 of Πυτίνῃ (Cratinus) ληρεῖς ἔχων· γράφ' αὐτὸν Ἐν ἐπεισοδίῳ, N. objects to the interpretation of ἐπεισοδίου as τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον τῷ δράματι γέλωτος χάριν ἔξω τῆς ὑποθέσεως, and, comparing frag. 14 ἐν τοῖς λύχνουσι γράψον, proposes to read ἐν σκιράφοις. "Clisthenes, qui ridiculus est dum aetatis flore tesseris ludit, collocandus est, ubi τὰ κυβεντικὰ ὄργανα veneunt."

Frag. 1 of Ωραι (Cratinus) he finds no explanation of the epithet ὁ λὸ φωνος ἀλέκτωρ satisfactory; and since he thinks the mention of the cock's crest almost necessary, he suggests that Cratinus may have written λοφόφωνος.

On Plato Com. fr. incert. 58 he believes that Phrynichus has confounded

ψυχροραγεῖν 'quod de moribundis in usu est' with ψυχρορροφεῖν, and that the allusion is to the Athenian habit 'vinum aqua nivea frangere.' He shows that snow for this purpose was an article of merchandise, and suggests as an emendation of Lucian, de Merc. cond. 26, where the slighted guest is told οὐτε ψὸν ἔχεις μόνος and the refusal of an egg is incredible, that we should read χιών': 'Nivis usus ad luxuriam pertinet.'

On Antiphanes, Διπλάσιοι fr. 2, which contains the remarks of a slave that it is those who wish to live that have to die, τοὺς γλιχομένους δὲ ζῆν κατασπᾶ τοῦ σκέλους | ἄκοντας ὁ Χάρων, and ends with (in Mein.) ὁ δὲ λιμός ἐστιν ἀθανασίας φάρμακον, Naber points out that what Antiphanes really meant to say was that the famished desired to die and were glad when death came to them. He therefore conjectures εὐθανασίας, but in this he has been anticipated by Bothe (Didot), who, however, wrongly objects to ἀθανασίας on the score of quantity. This article of Naber's contains many acute remarks; but his habit of indicating the fragments by referring to the pages of the author by whom they are cited, and only occasionally to the pages of Meineke or to the play of which they formed part, renders it hard to read with proper attention.

The next article is by Cobet on the fragments recently published from a papyrus of the 2d century B. C. by H. Weil. This subject being discussed in another paper in this Journal, p. 187, it is unnecessary here to say anything about it.

Cobet has next an article of 40 pages on Thucydides, lib. I, II, as published (1877-8) by Herwerden.

On I 10, 2, he maintains against H. that τῶν πέντε τὰς δύο μοίρας means simply two-fifths of the soil of Peloponnesus, and not Laconia and Messenia, as the Schol. assert. "Scholia in Thucydidem neque antiqua sunt et perexegui pretii. Constantinopoli scripta sunt a Graeculis neque doctis neque ingeniosis et perraro in iis aliquid reperias quod sit simul novum et bonum. Contra scaten erroribus et commentis, qualis est haec mirifica Peloponnesi in quinque partes descriptio."

On I 31, 3, οἱ δὲ Κορίνθιοι πιθόμενοι ταῦτα ἦλθον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας πρεσβευσόμενοι, he expels the last word not only as being an unnecessary repetition of what is implied in οἱ Κορίνθιοι ἦλθον, but also on the ground that πρεσβεῖν = *legatum esse* and πρεσβεύεσθαι = *legatos mittere*. He thinks that those who say that the middle is here used in the sense of the active are misled by misunderstanding VI 104 ὁ Γύλιππος—πρεσβευσάμενος: for "non solet is qui cum imperio est ipse legatus ire sed alios mittere, et πρεσβευσάμενος significat idem quod semper πέμψας πρεσβεντήν vel πρέσβεις. Tenemus igitur ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ interpolatores, qui de suo πρεσβευσόμενοι et πρεσβενόμενοι (V 39) addiderunt."

On I 32, 1, he insists on expelling the "additamentum prorsus inutile ac supervacaneum" ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς νῦν, and recommends a similar excision in I 82, 1, IV 92, 5, III 67, 7; 53, 1; and cites the Scholia on several other passages to show that they contain just such expressions, which, he believes, in the places above quoted have crept into the text.

On I 44 he repeats and confirms by additional arguments his proposal to change ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑστέρῃα into ὑστέρᾳ, though Herw. has refused to follow him. Of the three passages (III 91, 5, V 46, 1, VII 11, 2) cited by H. he disallows the interpretation of the two former and emends the last, maintaining that the

analogy of *τριταῖος*, etc., determines the use of *ὑστεραῖος*, which can only be used with *ἡμέρα* expressed or understood. The prep. *ἐν* in this case shows that the noun to be supplied is *ἐκκλησία* and not *ἡμέρα*, and therefore the reading must be *ὑστέρα*, and not *ὑστεραία*.

In c. 54 he finds no less than six *aliena additamenta*. And to show how such marginal comments crept into the text he quotes Galen's account of the process: *τάχα δέ τις προσέγραψεν ἕνεκεν ἑαυτοῦ, καθάπερ εἰδῶμεν ὑπόμνησιν ἐν τοῖς μετωπίοις (in marginibus) τὰ τοιαῦτα προσγράψειν, εἰά τις τῶν μεταγραφόντων τὸ βιβλίον ὡς αὐτοῦ τοῦ συγγραφέως ὃν εἰς τὸ ὕφος (in textum) αὐτὸ μετέθηκεν*.

In c. 73, 1, he changes *βουλευέσθε* after *ὅπως μὴ* into *βουλεύσεσθε*, re-asserting the *Canon Dawesianus* that *ὅπως*, *ὅτω τρόπῳ*, *οὐ μὴ* must be used with the future indicative or the subjunctive *second aorist*.

In c. 115, 5, instead of *τοὺς ὁμήρους κλέψαντες ἐκ Ἀθηνῶν* he writes *ἐκκλέψαντες*, for '*κλέπτειν de rebus poni solet, furtim aut furto surripere, ἐκκλέπτειν de personis, clam subducere*'; and so in Ar. Ach. 525 he wishes to read *νεανίαί 'κκλέπτουσι*.

In c. 137, 4, Thucyd. inserts in his report of the letter of Themistocles to Xerxes and his claim to reward for services rendered, his own comment, *γράφας τὴν ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος προάγγελσιν τῆς ἀναχωρήσεως καὶ τὴν τῶν γεφυρῶν, ἣν ψευδῶς προσεποιήσατο, τότε δὲ αὐτὸν οὐ διάλυσιν*. Cobet objects to the words *ἣν ψευδῶς προσεποιήσατο* (1) as inconsistent with the statement of Herod. VIII 109, which represents Themistocles as dissuading the Athenians from sailing immediately to the Hellespont. [But in c. 108 we are told that the suggestion to sail and destroy the bridge was made first by Themistocles to the assembled commanders and was rejected by the influence of Eurybiades.] (2) because *ψευδῶς* is unnecessary with *προσεποιήσατο*; "Athenienses in ea re dixissent: *ἣν ἐπλάσατο*; but chiefly (3) in consequence of their position between *τὴν τότε* and *οὐ διάλυσιν*.

In II 12, 4, *ἔγνων ὁ Ἀρχίδαμος ὅτι οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι οὐδέν πω ἐνδύσουσιν*, Herwerden has admitted the correction *ἐνδωσειούσιν*; on which Cobet remarks: "*ἐνδωσειῶ pugnāt cum natura verborum in -σειῶ, quae omnia notionem continent rei incundae et gratae, cuius quis cupidus esse possit*." You might properly say *ἀπαλλαξείῳ τοῦ πολέμου*, "*sed ἐπιθυμῶ ἐνδιδόναι contra naturam est*."

H. T. Karsten has a note on CICERO, *pro Flacco*, § 62, in which he repeats his formerly expressed opinion that the words *et eorum eadem terra parens, alitrix, patria dicatur*, were inserted by some commentator who remembered Isoc. *Paneg.* § 24, and failed to see that the corresponding words there have a justification which is wanting in the Latin. Karsten says that this parallel has escaped the commentators. The passage of Cicero is, however, quoted in Mr. Sandys' note on the *Panegyricus*.

Herwerden offers emendations: on Ar. Eq. 935 (*πρὶν* for *ἐτ'*, to prevent *οἰαίη* from being constructed with an infin.): Eur. Alc. 827 (*ὄνσπρόσωπον* for *καὶ πρόσωπον*): Hippol. 253 (*πρὸς ἄκρον καὶ μὴ μυελὸν ψυχῆς* for *καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἄκρον*, on the ground that *ἄκρον* cannot mean *intimum*. He makes the sense: *ita ut tangatur tantum modo quasi superficies (τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ψυχῆς) non vero intimae eius partes (ὁ μυελὸς τῆς ψυχῆς)*; and proposes three other slight changes.

The last page contains seven emendations of Galen by Cobet.



## PART II.

Cobet continues his critical notes on Van Herwerden's edition of Thucydides. The expression in II 77, 1, ἀπορον εἶναι ἀπὸ τῶν παρόντων δεινῶν ἐλεῖν τὴν πόλιν, in which H. with Krüger omits δεινῶν, Cobet emends by reading ὑπὸ for ἀπὸ, quoting II 102, 2, ἀπορον ποιεῖ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν χειμῶνι στρατεῦειν, ὑπὸ τινος being often used "de impedimento quod quo minus aliquid fiat impedit."

In II 80, 2, τῷ ναυτικῷ περιήγγειλαν παρασκευασαμένῳ πλεῖν he reads -μένοις, remarking "in talibus ἡ πρὸς τὸ σημαίνόμενον σύνταξις est necessaria," and quoting several passages in Thucyd. where it is used.

In II 91, 1, παρεσκευάζοντο ἀμυνόμενοι H. inserts ὥς. On this Cobet remarks that though in other writers this correction would be necessary, it is not so in Thucyd., who frequently omits ὥς in such cases: e. g. II 18, 1, προσβολὰς παρεσκευάζοντο τῷ τείχει ποιησόμενοι. In II 92, 6, he emends φοβούμενοι τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων βοήθειαν by reading Ἀθηνῶν, and after referring to several other places where a similar correction has been made by Dobree, etc., he says: 'facile est ubique verum discernere, namque ἐκ et ἀπὸ componuntur cum verbis τῶν Ἀθηνῶν, contra παρά cum verbis τῶν Ἀθηναίων, and refers to VI 71, 2, where both expressions occur.

In II 102, 5, he approves of Herwerden's suggestion of Ἀπόλλωνα for Ἀπόλλω in λέγεται—τὸν Ἀπόλλω-χρῆσαι, since it is only after νή and μά that the forms Ἀπόλλω and Ποσειδῶ are used.

In III 38, 1, he proposes to change τὰς ἡμετέρας ξυμφοράς into τὰ ἡμέτερα ξύμφορα, not remembering apparently that Krüger had done the same thing before. The change is, however, unnecessary. So in III 40, 7, he conjectures τότε for ποτέ, which has been suggested by Krüger and Classen.

On III 84, which he agrees with all the commentators in regarding as spurious, he says: 'non premam suspicionem quae mihi haec saepius consideranti in mentem venit. Suspitor esse locum Philisti, quem imitatore Thucydidis et 'paene pusillum Thucydidem' scimus fuisse. In aliquo vetusto codice locus ob argumenti quandam similitudinem in margine adscriptus videtur irrepisse in codices nostros, quos satis constat omnes ex uno fonte fluxisse.'

Following Cobet's article, which occupies 32 pages, is another of 35 pages by Herwerden himself on passages in the sixth and eighth books of Thucydides. In these he suggests a large number of corrections of the text, many of which, though certainly not all, he will introduce into his forthcoming edition of these books. He seems in some cases to be unduly reticent of his own opinion. For example, in his second note, VI 2, 5, 6, he makes merry over the conjecture of Wölflin, accepted by Classen, that the employment by Thucydides in that passage of the forms βορρᾶς and ἐνεκεν, instead of βορέας and ἐνεκα, which he has in all other places, was due to his following there, not only in his facts but his forms, the authority of Antiochus of Syracuse: "cuius Σικελιώτις συγγραφὴ excepta ab ipso tanquam a puero in ludo litterario effecit ut vir gravissimus sui sermonis ita turpiter oblitus sit, ut insolitis vocabulorum formis in hac operis parte uteretur." But Herwerden offers no explanation himself of the anomaly. Again, in commenting on the chapters which give the account of the overthrow of the Pisistratidae he enlarges at considerable length on the apparent inconsistency of Thucydides in laboring to prove that Hipparchus was not τύραννος at the time of his assassination, and yet speaking of him in another passage as

if he were so; and yet he offers no explanation, as Classen does, of the phenomenon. In connection with this topic he mentions the recent recovery of the inscription quoted by Thucydides (c. 54) as occurring on the altar of Apollo in the Pythion, which was erected by Pisistratus, son of Hippias. This, Thucydides says, was still legible though ἀνδροῖς γράμμασιν. But it has been recently found "scriptum ita ut facillime adhuc legi possit," whence H. infers that it must have been retouched perhaps in Roman times; though, he adds, A. Kirchhoff does not think so. Another example of his candor is found in this: that whereas in his note on VI 4, 6, he says incidentally of the word ξυμμήκτων "constans veterum titulorum orthographia postulat ξυμμελκτων," when he comes to VIII 102 and has occasion to transcribe the word ὑπομίξαντες he observes "iniuria supra VI 4, 6, sollicitavi orthographiam ξυμμήκτων. Cf. C. I. A. I p. 93, Col. A, 1 sq."

These two articles, though they contain much that is acute and instructive, have very little which would be found interesting apart from the particular passages which are made the subject of comment.

The next article of 19 pages is also by Cobet, and contains remarks critical and explanatory on the letters of Cicero ad Familiares and ad Atticum. One or two specimens may be quoted. On ad Att. VI 171, he refers to the opinion of E. Desjardins in the *Revue de Philologie*, which was noted on p. 81 of this Journal, that the *oppidulum quod versu dicere non est* of Horace's fifth Satire was *Asculum Apulum* and not, as is commonly supposed, *Equus Tuticus* "car cette dernière ne se trouvait pas sur sa route." After pointing out that *Asculum* could be introduced into the Hexameter either by elision of the final syllable or by syncopation (as it is found in Silius Italicus), Cobet shows from a passage in this letter that Desjardins' assumption that travelers to Brundisium would not pass through Equus Tuticus is unwarranted; for Cicero writes to Atticus, who had just gone from Rome to Epirus through Brundisium: (litteras accepi) *omnes fere quas commemoras praeter eas, quas scribis Lentuli pueri et Equo Tutico et Brundisio datas.*

Some of his emendations are quite convincing. For instance, he quotes from ad Att. IV 15, 8, 'sed ad te—tota comitia perscribam; quae si, ut putantur, gratuita fuerint, plus unus Cato potuerit quam omnes QUIDEM iudices.' On this he says: eodem tempore de eadem re scripsit ad Quintum fratrem II, 15, 4, 'quae quidem comitia si gratuita fuerint, ut putantur, plus unus CATO Fuerit quam omnes leges omnesque iudices.' Uterque locus ex altero certa correctione emendari potest. Ad Atticum scripserat: 'plus unus Cato potuerit quam omnes LEGES OMNESQUE iudices': et ad fratrem: 'plus unus Cato POTUERIT quam omnes leges omnesque iudices.' He does not always, however, take pains to see whether his corrections may not have been anticipated by others, as has been before remarked in these reports. For example, on ad Att. IX 10, 3, he proposes OBLECTABAT for OBTEATAB, which is already in the notes; and he complains (ad Att. XIII 31, 2) that an emendation of Lambinus, KEKPIKA for KEKIBIKA 'spernitur'; but it is in the text of Nobbe.

An article follows of 29 pages by C. M. Francken on the oration of Cicero *pro Caelio*, which is well worth the close attention of all who are studying the speech.

H. T. Karsten offers a probable emendation of the exceedingly corrupt passage of Seneca, *Controv.* II 7, 9.

The last two pages of this number are filled by Cobet with some corrections of the text of Galen, and one of Lucian, *Piscat.* c. 21, which he proposes to emend by reading *ἐμὲ δὲ ἦν πον κρατούμενον ἰδὼς καὶ ΜΙΑΙ πλείους ὥσιν αἱ μέλαιναι, σὺ προσθεῖσα τὴν σαντῆς σῶζέ με.* "Namque sic demum Philosophia προσθεῖσα τὴν ἐαντῆς ψῆφον reum servabat, qui ἴσων τῶν ψήφων γενομένων absolvebatur."

C. D. MORRIS.

#### ARCHÄOLOGISCHE ZEITUNG, XXXVIIth year (1879), fourth number.

This number contains articles by Brunn, Furtwängler, Michaelis, Engelmann, Weil and Gardner, reports on the Pergamum and Olympia excavations, and a record of inscriptions from Olympia. There are four plates (13-16). Dr. Brunn's paper on the Laocoon is written in order to bring before the public the views of the late K. B. Stark, who was overtaken by death before he had fully worked over the materials which he had gathered. It appears that Stark had been much impressed by the remarks upon the Laocoon in Goethe's 'Wahrheit und Dichtung'—at the end of the eleventh book—and still more by the more elaborated comments found in the Propylaea. The important passage is as follows: "There is" (in the action) "only one moment of intensest interest: where one figure is made defenceless by the coils that envelop it, where the second, though still able to defend itself, is mortally wounded, while there is still hope of escape for the third." Goethe does not declare that the eldest son (on the right as you face the group) must actually escape, but this it is argued may safely be concluded from the slight hold which the serpent has upon him and from his position, "half turned away from his father." The worst that can befall him in making good his escape is to have his right arm broken. Stark claimed that this was true, and moreover, that in so representing one of the sons, the artists only followed an old version of the catastrophe. The authority upon which he mainly depends is Arctinus in the 'Sack of Troy,' as reported rather freely by Proclus: *ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τούτῳ δύο δράκοντες ἐπιφανέντες τὸν τε Λαοκόωντα καὶ τὸν ἔτερον τῶν παίδων διαφθεύουσιν*, *Chrestomathy*, p. 460, ed. Gaisford.

There are two articles by Michaelis; in the first one he deals with various plastic representations of Eros. A curious group in the collections at Doughty House, Richmond, is his starting-point. The group represents the child Eros, without wings, standing on tip-toe and reaching upward to pluck grapes from thick leafage which is above and behind him. Among these leaves is a smaller Eros and a Satyr, and behind the principal figure stands Pan at the base of the vine. The workmanship is coarse and probably of late Roman times. After comparing various similar figures of Eros with this one, and establishing the frequent representation of Eros plucking grapes in Greek sculpture, Michaelis asserts that the Borghese Eros (of the Louvre collection) must be added to the list of such representations. He rejects the previous attempts to explain it as 'Eros chasing a butterfly' and 'Eros playing ball.' Stark's application to this

statue of Callistratus' description of an Eros by Praxiteles is also rejected. Michaelis claims that Callistratus' words are solely applicable to the too-much restored Chigi Eros of the Dresden collection.

In his second article Michaelis deals with the "metrological bas-relief" among the Arundel marbles at Oxford, reproduced in the *Annali* 1874, plate 9, and assigned to the first half of the fifth century B. C. Vertue's catalogue describes it as follows: "A pediment in which there is in basso-relievo the figure of a man as big as the life, with his arms extended as if he was crucified, but no lower than about his paps is seen, the cornice cutting him off, as it were: and this extension of his arms is called a Grecian measure, and over his right arm is a Grecian foot." This relief has been generally interpreted as a record of the Greek fathom and foot. See Liddell and Scott under *ὀργυιά*. Dr. Michaelis measured the outstretched arms and the foot with the greatest care, and finding unexpected results, submitted his measurements to Hultsche, noting at the same time that the marble of the relief must have come from Asia Minor or one of the adjacent islands. The Samian foot measures 0.315 m. and the Athenian foot 0.308 m. The difficulty lies in the fact that the foot represented in the relief measures only 0.259 m., much less than the Samian foot—though the relief probably came from Asia Minor—and less even than the Attic foot. Strangely enough, the length of the Roman foot, 0.2597 m., varies only slightly from the one upon the relief. But what had a Greek in the first half of the fifth century B. C. to do with the Roman foot? Dr. Hultsche unravels the mystery by declaring that this relief does not represent measures of length at all, but is simply an artist's modulus. The foot measures just one-seventh of the distance from finger-end to finger-end of the outstretched arms—which measures the height of a man—and thus the relief records the normal proportion between the length of a man's foot and his height.

Furtwängler discusses four bronze figures found at Olympia, which bear unmistakable marks of their Phoenician origin, since they resemble the common Assyrian representation of the god Assur; these bronzes were riveted to cauldrons of the same metal, and were used to hang them up by.

Then follow three controversial articles, the first on the interpretation of artists' names inscribed upon vases, the second (which is in English) maintains that *Φάνος* stands for the genitive form *Φάνεος* in an inscription upon an electrum coin found in Asia Minor (Halicarnassus), and finally in the third there is a long argument, with which the editor in a note at the end finds some fault, by which Engelmann strives to prove that the subject of two much discussed vase-paintings is the struggle between Herakles and Erginus.

A short account of the excavations at Pergamum calls attention to the modern spirit of the great works just found there, and to the light thrown by them upon the unsettled question as to the date of the Laocoon. Then follow the description of a statue discovered at Gaza and a report of the various celebrations in honor of Winckelmann. In the 37th report on the excavations at Olympia, which comes next, is the following summary of the number of things discovered during the four winters beginning with 1875-76:—

1328 sculptures, 7464 bronzes, 2094 terra cottas, 696 inscriptions and 3035 coins.

Of all the inscriptions unearthed at Olympia a very complete record has been made in this periodical from the first.

In the 38th report from Olympia is an account of the discovery of the head of the Nike of Paionios. Unfortunately, the face is gone. The inscriptions from Olympia in this number (326-333) throw light upon the practice of repeating inscriptions in some place more fully in view when, through any change in its surroundings, the original was hidden. The following hexameter,

Πεισαῖοι Σπερχεῖδιν ἀμβροτος εἵνεκα μολπῆς. Ὀλπ σνγ' (233 A. D.)

was inscribed upon a pedestal found December 27, 1879. It probably refers to the contests in music, which as shown by other inscriptions (see No. 261) became a regular part of the Olympian games in Roman times.

The first number for 1880 contains eight plates (1-8) of exceptional beauty and interest, notably 1 and 8.

The articles are by Conze, Michaelis, Brunn, Hübner, Petersen, Ernst Curtius and Th. Mommsen.

Conze discusses twenty-three votive offerings, more than half of them from Attica and the rest from Boeotia, Asia Minor, the islands of the Archipelago, or from unknown places. They all are bas-reliefs representing in most cases certainly and in all probably the mother of the gods (Cybele) as the central figure. At her side stands a god in the attitude and with the attributes of an *οἶνοχόος*. Heretofore the central figure has been in some of the reliefs called Hecate, while the wine-pourer has been explained commonly as Attis. The attributes of the great goddess, which are unmistakably given in most cases, are pointed out to prove that all these bas-reliefs represent that goddess, while the *οἶνοχόος*, since he never has the Asiatic costume appropriate to Attis and sometimes holds the *κηρύκειον*, while in many cases he is of the same stature with the goddess, cannot be Attis and must be a divinity. Hence the god Kadmilos is the one represented; for Kadmilos in Samothrace was closely connected with the worship of the mother of the gods, and was elsewhere identified with Hermes. Hermes, as the god of the wind, brought rain, and with it fertility, hence he is appropriately represented as the giver of wine to the divinity who is mother of the gods and giver of increase to all. This connection of Hermes and Cybele and the offering of these votive offerings belonged to the earlier and less corrupt form of the worship of the great goddess, as is made plain by the early date of most of these votive bas-reliefs.

The next paper is by Michaelis, and is mainly devoted to examining all the inscriptions attributing the Medicean Venus to the Athenian Cleomenes, son of Apollodorus. They are all classed by Michaelis among the ingenious forgeries of which in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries so many clever and learned Italians seem to have been guilty. The argument is as follows: No inscription is mentioned either by Aldovrandini, by Perrier, by Sandrart or in the official inventory. It was not until after the statue began to be much admired that Episcopus (Bisschop) about 1675 revealed the following inscription:—

Κλεωμένης Ἀπολλοδώρου Ἀθηναῖος ἐποίησεν.

This inscription was formerly under the statue, but has disappeared, though fortunately it is preserved by a cast taken for Louis XIV which is in the Louvre. The shape of the former pedestal is also known from this cast, and it is dis-



tinctly modern in shape; moreover, the omegas *curved* at the bottom have a very spurious look. The inscription now on the pedestal at Florence is plainly a copy of the other, and it is inserted into the pedestal, being of different material; however, the  $\omega$  in Cleomenes is corrected to  $o$  and the form  $\epsilon\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\iota$  is changed to  $\epsilon\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu$ . The only difficulty in explaining the first inscription as a forgery lies in the fact that Cleomenes was not a well-known artist. Pliny (36, 33) mentions his group of the Thespiades (cf. Diod. Sic. 4, 29)<sup>1</sup>, and the learned forger must therefore have taken his cue from Pliny; at all events, the father's name Apollodorus was pure invention if this be a case of forgery. The effect upon sensual observers of Cleomenes' group of the Thespiades as described by Pliny (36, 39) is ingeniously compared with a similar story about the Medicean Venus told by Baldinucci. This point of resemblance, it is claimed, would be enough to induce the forger to pitch upon Cleomenes.

In the next article Dr. Brunn discusses the various representations of the act  $\upsilon\pi\omicron\beta\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ , and then follows an account by Hübner of the authentic bust of Seneca which is in the Berlin Museum as part of a Double Herme representing Seneca and Socrates. Though Seneca is plainly inscribed below this head, and though the constant imitation of Socrates by Seneca adds a confirmation, if any be required, to the authenticity of this bust, Visconti in his *Iconographie Romaine* merely gives an outline of this head, and chooses a bronze bust found in the library at Herculaneum as the portrait of Seneca. Hübner's article is accompanied by an admirable plate representing the Double Herme, and by a cut after a strikingly similar head upon a gem which he saw in Spain, and which, it was reported, had been found near Corduba, the home of Seneca's family.

In the closing article of this number Dr. Theodor Mommsen, treating of busts accompanied by inscriptions, declares that this Double Herme at Berlin is undoubtedly authenticated as Seneca's portrait, and then brings us back to the bronze which Visconti engraved as Seneca. Comparetti, on the strength of an inscription which does not surely belong to it, asserts that it represents the consul Lucius Piso (Cicero's enemy). This attribution Mommsen sharply criticizes. The existence of other copies of this head, one with a laurel wreath, and the long beard which was banished from polite society in Cicero's time, ought, he thinks, to disprove Comparetti's theory; but he also combats the interpretation of the inscription on which this false attribution is based, and closes after correcting other errors of a less serious nature in connection with similar inscriptions, by strongly urging upon archaeologists the necessity of mastering epigraphy.

Petersen gives a new interpretation of the passage in Pliny (N. H. 34, 75)

<sup>1</sup> The citation of Diod. Sic. 4, 29 in Mr. Dyer's report is not unnecessary, for while the heroines of the thirteenth labor of Herakles ought to be sufficiently well known, yet in dictionaries and commentaries the Thespiades of the famous legend have been confounded with the 'Thespiades Musae.' The article in the new Latin Dictionary simply reproduces Freund; Cic. Verr. 2, 4, 2, 4 and Plin. 36, 5, 4, 39, there cited, refer to Herakles' Thespiades who were familiar enough to the Romans. Cf. Sen. Trag. Herc. 372 (Leo): *nempe Thespiades vacat | brevique in illas arsit Alcides face*. The number of the statues was probably seven, as Preller suggests (Gr. Myth. II 180 note), for the mothers of the  $\delta\eta\mu\omicron\upsilon\chi\omicron\iota$  of Thespie, seven of the sons having remained in Thespie, two in Thebes, while the rest joined Iolaos in the colonization of Sardinia, according to Diod. Sic. 4, 29 above cited.

describing Canachus' statue of Apollo with a stag. He claims that the stag was in Apollo's hand, and argues that *calx* can mean 'the root of the hand' in this context. At the end of the article he gives some account of Myron's Satyr.

Dr. Ernst Curtius describes a bronze statuette lately bought at Paestum, where it was probably found. The figure represents a canephoros and is very beautiful. The inscription around its base—which is an Ionic capital—is as follows: *Τάθ' ἀνα Φιλῶ Χαρμυλίδᾳ δεκάταν*. Thus it is probable that there were emoluments connected with the duties of canephoros. This bronze has great value, as it is the only known example of the earlier representations of the canephoros, and serves to correct many false views about those figures.

After a report of the additions made in 1879 to the Royal collections at Berlin come four reports of the excavations at Olympia. Up to January 1st the most important discoveries were the right foot of the Praxitelean Hermes, a few fragments from the eastern pediment of the temple of Zeus, and a very well preserved altar for burnt offerings. Meanwhile the whole southern part of the Palaestra was uncovered. During January the large Gymnasium of Olympia was reached and the Palaestra was more fully uncovered, also portions of the Megarian treasure-house with the inscription *Μεγαρέων* in the centre of the architrave. During February and March the liberality of the Emperor of Germany made it possible to increase the force at work. The head of the babe Dionysus (belonging to the figure held by the Praxitelean Hermes) was discovered; a number of metopes and fragments belonging to the pediments of the great temple were also found.

The inscriptions (334-362) published in this number are particularly interesting. No. 346 chronicles four names of Eleians all of the same family, as winners in the races. Of these two are women: *Τιμαρέτα Φιλίστου Ἥλεια Ὀλύμπια συνωρίδι τελεία* and *Θεοδότα Ἀντιφάνους Ἥλεια Ὀλύμπια ἄρματι πωλικῇ*. Perhaps the most valuable inscription recorded is a very old one on a fragment of bronze, which the combined ingenuity of A. Kirchhoff and Georg Curtius, with the help of many others, has not as yet fully deciphered. It is an ancient Rhethra, referring not to any treaty, but simply chronicling the law regulating the introduction of new members into the Eleian Phratries. The form *Ἰάρρενον* (*ἄρρενος*) shows an unexpected digamma, and this inscription also contains other interesting dialectic forms, such as *βασιλᾶες*, nominative plural, and *τιμαῖς*, accusative plural.

LOUIS DYER.

#### HERMES. 1880.

No. II. H. Diels (Berlin) presents a number of emendations of passages in the fragments of Empedocles. Among the critical appliances employed by Diels in this paper are the following: the phraseology of Homer, the formal prototype of E.; imitations by Lucretius; references in Aristotle and elsewhere; the observation of metrical usages in Empedocles. Diels also adds four passages supplementary to the present collection, condemning however as spurious the six lines adopted by Stein from Cramer's *Anecdota*.

The next paper, by A. Breysig (Erfurt), is likewise a critical one, referring to Avienus' translation of Aratus' *Phenomena*.

W. Luthe discusses a number of passages in Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, both in Book A and in  $\alpha$ , either changing the punctuation or proposing a new reading, or restoring the older reading prevailing before Bonitz's edition of the *Metaphysics*. He makes little use of the MSS., but employs his theory of the necessary connection of the *thought* as the chief organon of criticism. In the last four pages (pp. 207-210) Luthe discusses the tradition found as early as Alexander of Aphrodisias, that Book  $\alpha$  is not genuine, but declares both the external and internal evidence to be of little value toward proving the spurious character of the book.

A. Klügmann (Rome), in a letter to the eminent Latin antiquarian, Jordan of Königsberg, discusses the two appendices to the description of the *regiones* of Rome. These appendices are indices of public works at Rome (coeval with the era of Constantine); the first according to Klügmann being really a supplement to the description of the *regiones*, and the second a register. Klügmann dissents from Jordan mainly as to the interpretation of the order of enumeration. Among the classes enumerated are the following: *montes, campi, fora, basilicae, thermae, obelisci, pontes, aquae, viae, bibliothecae, naumachiae, balinea*. The great turnpikes enumerated are 28 in number, but they include several branch roads. Of *aquae* or water conduits 18 are given; two separate ones came from the Arno. There are enumerated 11 *fora* and the same number of *thermae*, 8 bridges and 7 *montes*; the last two almost a sacred number; and it deserves notice that with this fixity of the number the names vary somewhat. In the present list old Quirinalis and Viminalis are not given, but the transtiberine Vaticanus and Janiculensis instead.

Dittenberger (Halle), in his Notes on the Ionic Vowel-system, calls attention to a very important matter. From a study of inscriptions from Keos published recently by Koehler (*Mittheilungen des athenischen Instituts* I, p. 139 sqq.), he finds that the characteristic Ionian *eta* is expressed by H, whereas the common Greek *eta* is represented by an E. From this difference in sign which is consistent, Dittenberger infers a difference in sound. Later, it is true, from the beginning of the fourth century B. C., the sound (as the sign) for both *etas* seems to become uniform; in the course of this century Attic usage exerted a very strong influence upon the Ionic neighbors of Attica.

H. Haupt (Würzburg) and V. Jagić discuss a Slavic translation of the Byzantine chronicler Joannes Malalas and its importance for the purpose of reviewing the present text (Bonn edition). Prof. Jagić considers the Slav manuscript in question which is at St. Petersburg as less weighty for critical purposes than Haupt assumes; in fact, he takes it to be merely an abstract.

J. Draheim (Berlin) writes (pp. 238-243) de Iambis et Trochaeis Terentii.

Th. Mommsen. *Zur Kritik Ammians*. An inscription has recently been discovered at Rome, under the Ponte San Sisto, which proves that the latter was dedicated in 366 or in the earlier part of 367 A. D., when Valentinianus I was Emperor of the West, Symmachus praefectus urbi having superintended the work. Besides affording a valuable date for the topography of Rome, a passage in Ammianus Marcellinus 27, 3, which was suspected, is confirmed as genuine by the inscription.

A. Gemoll reviews and supplements Hyginus' *De munitionibus castrorum [aestivalium]*.

Professor Vahlen of Berlin contributes a series of critical notes under the title of 'Varia,' on passages in Plautus' *Trinummus* and *Bacchides*, on several of Ennius' fragments, Cicero *De Republica*, Seneca *De Brevitate Vitae*, Petronius. These discussions are very suggestive, as illustrating the method of 'conservative criticism,' and present solid gains to exegesis; e. g. (p. 262) he discusses Ennius' *Iphigenia* in Gellius 19, 10 (p. 39 in Ribbeck's collection):

1. *Otio qui nescit uti*
2. *Plus negoti habet quam cum est negotium in negotio.*
5. *Otioso in otio animus nescit quid velit,*

where Vahlen, retaining *negotium in negotio*, illustrates it from Ovid, "et Venus in vinis ignis in igne fuit," and other analogies. Again, Horace *Epist.* 2, 1, 75:—

*Si versus paullo concinnior unus et alter  
Iniuste totum ducit venditque poema,*

illustrating the words *ducit venditque* as a compact phrase of selling (slaves) from Terent. *Eumch.* 1, 2, 54, and *Hautontimorumenos* 1, 1, 92.

Johannes Schmidt (Athens), having recently examined some of the Delphian inscriptions (published by Wescher and Foucart, 1868), offers sundry supplements.

T. H. Mordtmann of Constantinople publishes and discusses a Roman inscription recently found at Charput in Armenia among the foundations of the church of St. Mamas, and sent by an Armenian clergyman there to the Armenian patriarch at Constantinople. The inscription, on which Mommsen also remarks, was made about 63–64 A. D. under Nero, in the eastern campaign of Corbulo (*Tacit. Annal.* XV), who compelled the Armenian prince Tiridates to receive his throne as a fief of the Roman emperor.

Th. Mommsen calls attention to the signal value of *Cod. Vaticanus* 191 with regard to the text of Ptolemy's *Geography*, expressing his belief that 'this Vatican MS. occupies a similar position in the criticism of Ptolemy as that of the Escorial in the criticism of the Antoninian *Itinerarium*, i. e., that the testimony of it alone weighs at least as much as that of all the other MSS. taken together.' Mommsen illustrates this by comparing quotations from the Vaticanus and from the Vulgate. Carl Müller of Göttingen, at Mommsen's request, gives a description of the MS.

The last paper of this number is by H. Leo (Bonn), *Excursus zu Euripides Medea*. (1) He discusses the chorus 824 sqq., its metrical arrangement, and the agreement of its subject-matter with the paintings on certain Attic vases with gold ornamentation. (2) Emendations on the chorus 1251 sqq.: for 1256 Leo now proposes: *ἐβλασταν, θεοῦ δ' αἶμα πίνειν φόβος*; and in 1266, *χόλος προσπίπτει καὶ* (for *καὶ*) *δυσμενὲς φόνος ἀμείβεται*; in 1269 for the probably corrupt *ἐπὶ γαῖαν: ἔπεται*. (3) Comments on some points in the plot, e. g. the figure of Aegeus, and assumes from 663 sqq. that the poet conceives the latter as one of the Argonauts. Exegesis of 734–740. (4) A series of critical remarks on passages from 96–212.

No. III.—The Elymaeans on the Caspian Sea as noticed in Polybius and Ptolemy, by T. Olshausen. Olshausen suggests that these "Elymaeans" north of Media are essentially the race which is known to modern Orientalists as



Dilemites, *Δελυμαῖται*. These Delymaeans were comparatively unknown to the Greek West, and so they probably received from the Greeks the name of Elymaeans, a people living in the highlands of Iran north of Persis, and much better known to the Greeks. The Dilemites, as well as their neighbors the Geli, were really races belonging to the nationality of the Cadusians.

Ph. Thielmann, on Cornificius (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*), Grammatical and Critical Notes. Thielmann often makes changes by suggesting the error to have arisen from the pronunciation of the 'Vulgärsprache' used by the copyist (p. 333). Thus in II 22, 34, *prae ceteris* rose from an original *praeceptrix*, through the current pronunciation *praeceptris* or *praeceptris*.

A. Reusch, on the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum* II. Reusch attempts to supply lacunae in inscriptions and to furnish dates from certain established usages of language and formulas peculiar to certain periods, e. g. the addition of the month is a practice occurring after 337 B. C. (Ol. 110, 3). Inscriptions before Ol. 115, 1 (319 B. C.) do not give the patronymic of the prytane, nor do they mention the *συνπρόεδροι*, and so material is afforded for supplementing lacunae with approximate certainty.

C. A. Lehmann, in *Questiones Tullianae*, part IV, continues his Ciceronian emendations (*Pro Sulla*, ad Atticum, ad Familiares, *Oratio cum senatu gratias egit*, and *De Domo*)—16 in all.

C. T. Neumann (Tübingen), the Extent of the Chronicle of Malalas in the Oxford MS. This MS. of the Byzantine historian is defective at the beginning, in the middle and at the end. Neumann, by counting the notation of quaternions (properly eight leaves each), finds that there have been lost fol. 1-8 (the first quaternion), and fol. 9 (the first leaf of the 2d quaternion). There are also now wanting two leaves, both after 321 (present number) and before 318. As for these losses, the Paris excerpta supply about two-thirds of the lost introduction.

H. Droysen, some Epigraphic Notes. 1. On the size of the letters in the Greek inscriptions. Arguments having been deduced from the size of letters to prove that a certain inscription could not have been in a certain place, H. Droysen points, e. g., to the Lysicrates monument at Athens, the letters of which are generally 0.025 M. high, the monument itself being about 9 M. above the ground. The accommodation of the size of letters to the exigencies of reading on the part of the visitor seems to have begun only in the age of the Diadochi.

2. Regarding the history of the Greek alphabet. The Thasians [an inference] wrote C for B and Ω for O about 500 B. C.

3. Wood's discoveries of inscriptions show the Calendar of Ephesus: e. g. an inscription of 104 A. D. cites the following names of months: *Προσειδών, Θαρρηλιών, Ἀνθεστηριών*, the old Ionic terms. This authentic document must cause a correction of the MS. Hemeralogies.

4. On the Attic Calendar. An Eleusinian inscription recently found states that the archon (Eponymos) of the next year (somewhere between 454 and 432) should intercalate an extra Hecatombaeon month.

F. Blass. New Fragments of an Historian, in the Egyptian Museum at Berlin. The material and general make-up of this interesting relic is said by Kirchhoff to resemble somewhat the famous papyrus containing the fragments of Hyperides.



A Paris expert suggests the date to have been probably not later than the second century A. D. Kirchhoff himself thinks the MS. is later. O is very small and broad, E is broad, B, P and Θ are very narrow, Z and Ξ reach under the line. The rough breathing is sometimes expressed in various ways. Iota subscript is omitted. The only abbreviation is ω for ων. As to the contents of the fragment, the first thing appearing is a long quotation from Solon, fr. 36 and 37 (Bergk), making it now quite evident that the two fragments are one passage. A number of valuable readings are gained from the present quotation of the Solonian passage, e. g. ἡθη δεσποτῶν, vulg. ἡθη δ. (anticipated by Bergk), κράτη (acts of violence), vulg. κράτει.

Further on an account of the στάσεις at Athens between the factions preceding the tyrannis of Pisistratus is given, following upon the management of Solon. This is preceded by a narrative of the contest for the archonship before the introduction of the nine annual archons. Some new light is here thrown upon a subject of Attic antiquities. Of the old three γένη, Eupatridae, Geomori, Demiurgi, we find here instead of Geomori ἄποικοι, i. e. those living away (from the city), the country people; cf. Dionys. H., Antiq. Rom. II 8. Other material statements of this MS. are, that the last archon of Attica elected for ten years was called Damasias, and that he was expelled at the end of two years; that the first set of nine archons were elected as follows: four from the noble families, three from the farmers, two from the artisans.

Fragment II is much more defective. We gather from it the banishment of some one ([ὦ]στρακίσθη, Μεγακλῆς δ') . . . but not of Megaeles, according to Blass' criticism. In l. 12 sq. the fragment reads with Blass' emendations: [καὶ πρῶ]τος ὡστρακίσθη τῶν [τοιούτων ἀνδρῶν] Ξάνθιππος ὁ Ἀρίφ[ρωνος] . . . father of Pericles, a statement found also elsewhere. There is also something said of the silver mines at Maroneia. The reverse of this leaf (frag. II) is also very defective; the narrative seems to refer to the constitutional reforms of Cleisthenes. Blass, in summing up, suggests that Theopompus was the author, and that the present find is fragments from his Philippica L. 10 (περὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων δημογῶν).

Prof. A. Kirchhoff publishes an inscription recently found at Mylasa in Caria, near the N. E. side of the temple of the Carian Zeus. Kirchhoff finds that the inscription is the supplement to C. I. Gr. No. 2693 (Boeckh). As for the structure of the language of the decree, it may be noticed that the Fut. Ind. is used by the side of the Imperative third person and of the Infinitive, thus, e. g.: οὐ παραχωρήσει δὲ οὐδὲ ὀφείλων φόρον . . . (p. 284), and again: ἡ δὲ πρᾶξις ἐσται, etc.

Mommsen reprints a decree of Commodus found as an inscription by the French scholar Dr. Dumartin at Suk el Khmis, on the road from Carthage to Bulla, the inscription having been first published in the *Revue Critique*, Jan. 30, 1880. The main purpose of Mommsen's present paper is antiquarian and historical. The documents are interesting. There is (1) a petition of (*coloni*) farmers on an imperial domain, the 'saltus Buronitanus,' with the rescript of the emperor given as a marginal *subscriptio* returned with the *libellus*. (2) The procurator of the emperor, residing at Carthage, receives notice of the former and passes it on. (3) Chrysanthus, probably in charge of the provincial archives, sends the decree on. (4) Andronicus receives the decree from or

through the two foregoing officials. Mommsen discusses at length the legal status of the private domains of the emperors, such as this one was; the position of the farmers, their rights, duties, etc.; that of the imperial *conductores*, against the undue exactions of whom the petition by the farmers in the present instance was directed. The *conductor*, as Mommsen takes it, was the chief tenant, who had rented the large estate in the domain, the *villa*. The *coloni* were small farmers, who were obliged to give six days' service per annum to the *conductor*. These specifications were due to a law of Hadrian.

Th. Thalheim contributes critical remarks and emendations on nine passages in the orator Lycurgus.

Olshausen reports on a MS. of Ptolemy, bearing at the head a picture of a sultan, Arslân, as O. interprets the adjoined Arabic characters. Olshausen now finds that the figure of the prince is intended for the sovereign of the Turcomans "of the white ram," a brother-in-law of Muhammed II, the Ottoman conqueror of Constantinople in 1453, and was intended by the sultan for Arslân, having been executed at the sultan's order by the Greek scholar George of Trebizond.

R. Ellis, of Oxford, describes a MS. of Ovid's *Ars amatoria* I, apparently written in Wales in the latter part of the IXth century, and now in the Bodleian library at Oxford, and gives on four pages the readings of the Oxford MS. differing from Merkel's edition of 1877.

H. Tielke discusses some metrical points in Nonnus.

Hans Wirz (Zurich) discusses fragments of Juvenal recently found at Aarau, the value of the MS. resembling that of the codex Pithoeanus at Montpellier.

G. Kaibel, of Breslau, contributes *Sententiarum Liber Primus*. He explains the difficult and corrupt passage Fulgentius *Mythol.* III, from Ovid *Met.* II 29; another passage, Euphorion's epigram 'in *Naufragum*,' he corrects from Rhianus, and comments critically and exegetically on a number of other passages incidental to his collection, especially from Theocritus (on pp. 451-457). Of more general interest is the fact to which Kaibel calls attention pp. 458 sq., that the epitaph of Herodes Atticus proves the renewed popularity of the epic writer Antimachus, in accordance with the renaissance movement of the age of Hadrian.

F. Gustavson (Helsingfors) speaks of some MSS. of Cicero *De Finibus* which have been somewhat underrated by Madvig.

H. Dessau establishes a connection between the Caecilius Natalis of Cirta, whose name recurs so frequently in inscriptions of the year 210-218 (time of Caracalla) and the Caecilius Natalis who figures as one of the interlocutors in the Octavianus of Minucius Felix. Thus the date of the latter work would be brought down to the period mentioned.

E. G. SIHLER.

ANGLIA. Zeitschrift für englische Philologie. Herausgegeben von R. P. WÜLCKER und M. TRAUTMANN. III Band, 1 Heft, Halle, 1879; 2 und 3 Heft, 1880.

I.—A. Schmidt opens the first number of the third volume of the *Anglia* with a criticism of the text of 'King Lear.' Schmidt comments on the condition of the text of Shakespeare's plays, and the custom in England of forming an eclectic text from the quartos and the folio, states that 'the only serious attempts to go to the bottom of the matter have been made in Germany,' ascribes the origin of the quartos to copies made by rapid writers at the representation of the plays, sets out to prove this in the case of 'one of the so-called authentic quartos,' and says that its variations, in comparison with the folio text, deserve no consideration, except where they are corrections of manifest misprints. These positions are sustained as follows: 1. The quartos know no difference between prose and verse; 2. Many mistakes of the quartos prove that they were caused by false hearing, not false reading; 3. A few attempts at emendation show plainly the way in which the quarto editors formed their text; 4. The involuntary use of interjections by the actors is seen in these copies, even where they destroy the verse; 5. The peculiar kind of omissions found in the quartos. While noticing the preference of Delius for the folio text, Schmidt charges him with inconsistency in taking up quarto readings which he had formerly rejected. Schmidt examines finally a number of passages in which recent editors have preferred the quarto readings, and earnestly defends the higher authority of the folio.

J. Zupitza supplies corrections to *Anglia* I 5, 195 and 286, and gives the beginning of a MS. of Caius College, Cambridge (No. 234), which is a heretofore unknown fragment of the 'Ancrén Riwe,' and belongs to the 13th century.

O. Schoepke closes his examination of Dryden's Paraphrase of Chaucer's Poems, considering—3. The Flower and the Leaf, though acknowledging that the original can no longer be regarded as Chaucer's work; 4. The Wife of Bath's Tale; and 5. The Character of a Good Parson, enlarged from Chaucer's happy touches in the Prologue. Schoepke finds, as before, that Dryden worked with great freedom, made changes here and there, omitted much, and treated much at greater length than the originals, introducing many new thoughts. So patent a result seems hardly worth the trouble of the investigation.

H. Varnhagen continues his contributions to Middle-English Poems, and prints for the first time from the Digby MS. 86—IV. The Sayings of St. Bernard, heretofore printed by Wright, and later by Bøddeker, from Harl. MS. 2253, and by Horstmann from Laud MS. 108. He also notes—V. that the first verse of 'Long Life' is found cited in the Kentish translation of the Homilies of Maurice de Sully.

W. Sattler continues his examples of the Use of Prepositions with—VI. *to be at home* and *to be home*.

H. Krebs refers to his communication on The Anglo-Saxon Translation of the Dialogues of Pope Gregory (*Anglia* II 65), and gives here the text of the Preface from the Cotton MS., which is closely related to the Cambridge MS., but the Hatton MS. shows an independent text.

H. Gering has an article on 'Beowulf and the Icelandic Grettissaga,' which develops more fully the view of G. Vigfússon, in the Prolegomena to his edition of the 'Sturlunga Saga,' repeated in his 'Icelandic Prose Reader,' that the myth of Beowulf's fight with the water-demons was known to the Scandinavians, and that in the Grettissaga this myth is found in a form which has the most striking similarity to the representation in Beowulf, even to minute details. Gering pronounces this 'eine hochwichtige entdeckung,' and gives with sufficient fullness the history of Grettir, the real personage (996-1031 A. D.), and a translation of those chapters of the saga which narrate his contests with the water-spirits. He wonders that the connection between Beowulf and Grettir has escaped Grimm, Thorkelin, Grundtvig and the English scholars, and remarks, 'Es gibt eben auch in der wissenschaft "Columbuseier."' While the resemblances in general are striking and cannot be denied, the differences are so numerous, and so material for the supposition of a necessary connection between the two stories, that Gering's assertion, 'the idea of an accidental similarity is absolutely excluded,' is hardly substantiated.

L. Proescholdt contributes a careful Collation of the Oldest Quarto of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus, which is found in the Bodleian library, using as a basis Dyce's reprint (1865) of this (1604) quarto, and comparing with it the recent editions of Wagner and of Ward. (See Anglia II 518.)

Among so-called Contributions to the Explanation of English Authors in I. O. Collmann has some emendations (!) to Addison, which would better have been omitted in a periodical like the Anglia. Loose expressions and constructions, verging on the ungrammatical, may be found in some of the best English writers, and do not require a German foot-rule to determine the percentage of variation.

There is more reason in II. H. Varnhagen's comments on two passages in 'The Tempest,' but the first has the same meaning, whichever reading we take, and the second is hardly an example of 'omitted relative.'

R. Wülcker does good service in reprinting from the only MS. known (Cotton, Vespasian D. XIV), An Anglo-Saxon Life of St. Neot. It has been twice printed, but in works rarely accessible, and is *probably* to be ascribed to Aelfric, although the language of this MS. is not earlier than the 12th century. This Life is also interesting from its notice of King Aelfred.

O. Lohmann contributes the weightiest article to the present number, on The Omission of the English Relative Pronoun, with special reference to the language of Shakespeare. After noticing what others have written on this subject, Schmitz, Maetzner, Koch, Fiedler and Sachs, Grimm, Steinthal, Tobler, Kölbinger, and especially Flebbe in Herrig's Archiv, LX 85, 'The elliptical relative sentence in English,' Lohmann makes the statement that the less frequent omission of the relative in Anglo-Saxon than in the later language is due to the influence of the Norman-French, which affected especially the order of words in English, and this influenced greatly the form of the relative sentence. He examines fully and carefully the use of the relative in Anglo-Saxon, citing numerous examples, and pronounces it a difficult question to decide whether in certain examples the relative or demonstrative is omitted, for authorities differ. He finds the origin of the so-called elliptical relative sentences in the greater



fullness of inflexion in Anglo-Saxon, and the omission is restricted to the subject in the earliest period; its wider extension is due, as stated, to the Norman-French. Examples from Chaucer are cited to sustain this view; the ellipsis was favored by the common form of the pronoun and conjunction *that*, which usurped the place of the relative *þe* (the). A careful examination is made of Shakespeare's language in respect to the omission of both the nominative and accusative, the latter most frequently, and *that* is the pronoun omitted, not the relative derived from the interrogative. This omission is due to Shakespeare's striving for conciseness, and is found much less frequently in Bacon. In the later language the ellipsis, especially of the nominative, is much more restricted, and some writers declare themselves against its omission in the accusative, but Lohmann rightly rejects this view and agrees with Abbott that '*that*, when an object, may be omitted, wherever the antecedent and subject of the relative sentence are brought into juxtaposition by the omission.' This article deserves the attention of all English grammarians.

H. Sweet has some useful contributions to English etymology in—I. Disguised Compounds in Old English, namely, *fultum*, *sulung*, *ldtleow*, *ldreow*, *intinga*, and Remarks on the preterite of *cuman*; and II. English Etymologies, *left* (as adjective), and *bless*, the former being A. S. *lyft*=*inanis*, hence *left hand* = 'weak or useless' hand; and the latter, A. S. *blétsian*, derived from *blôd*, hence originally 'to redden with blood,' and so to consecrate the altar by sprinkling with blood.

R. P. Wülcker has a short obituary notice of H. Leo, died 1878, and a correction to Anglia II 441, on the discovery of the Codex Vercellensis by Blume in 1822.

In the Book Notices R. P. Wülcker reports on Kölbing's *Englische Studien*, I 2 and 3, 1877, and II 1, 1878; J. Koch continues his notice of the Latest Publications of the Chaucer Society, 1877 and 1878; and L. Proescholdt reviews R. Prölss's edition of Shakespeare's Dramatic Works, Vols. I and II, Leipzig, 1878, including *Romeo and Juliet*, *Much Ado*, *Julius Caesar*, *Merchant of Venice*, *Richard II* and *Hamlet*.

M. Trautmann closes this number with a Notice of some School-books and Remarks on the *r*-sounds, said school-books being A. Wittstock's *Einführung in die Englische Sprache*, Leipzig, 1878; C. Deutschbein's *Theoretisch-praktische Lehrgang der englischen Sprache*, 4te Auflage, Cöthen, 1878; and W. Victor's *Englische Schulgrammatik. I. Formenlehre*. Leipzig, 1879. Trautmann finds fault with the insufficiency of what these writers have to say about the English *r*-sounds, though praising in general the Phonology of Victor's Grammar, and enters into a very full discussion of the *r*-sounds, of which lack of space forbids further notice.

II.—H. Wood contributes the first article, written in English, on Chaucer's Influence upon James I of Scotland as Poet. The article shows study. The author has carefully compared the King's Quair with Chaucer's poems, including both the genuine and the spurious, which would better have been separated, for coincidences with the latter add nothing to the argument, but some of his deductions seem strained. That King James had read both Chaucer and



Gower is manifest, from his calling them 'my maisteris dere' (quoted Anglia, p. 259), but it seems rather far-fetched to consider as proofs of borrowing such poetical commonplaces as calling the moon Cynthia and speaking of her golden tresses, taking up a book on account of sleeplessness, allusions to Fortune's wheel, tossing on the ocean, and invoking the Muses, references to the constellations, even when specific, and to the Fates. The garden scene (K. Q. II 11) may show a conscious remembrance of the Knight's Tale, 175 et seq. (Anglia, pp. 236-7), and King James had certainly read the Assembly of Foules (pp. 253-4), but it is not necessary to assume that all similar expressions or ideas are direct borrowings from Chaucer by the royal poet.

F. Kluge examines the relations between Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar and Mantuan's Eclogues, part of a lecture delivered in the English Seminary at Strasburg, which showed the dependence of Spenser on Virgil's Eclogues. E. K., who wrote the letter to Harvey prefixed to the Shepherd's Calendar, mentioned the Carmelite monk Johannes Baptista Mantuanus, but did not show sufficiently Spenser's dependence upon him. The result of Kluge's investigation is that Mantuan was the model for the moral-satiric Eclogues, Virgil for the elegiac and erotic.

H. Varnhagen continues his texts of Middle-English Poems with—VI. Le regret de Maximian, from MS. Digby 86, a better text than Harl. 2253, printed in Reliquiae Antiquae, and by Bøddeker, whose views Varnhagen combats; and with VII. The Sayings of St. Bernard (see IV), from the Vernon MS. and the Auchinleck MS., the latter only a fragment and already printed by the Abbotsford Club, 1857. These texts vary from each other and from the rest.

The chief article of this number is C. Horstmann's texts of the Prose-legends: I. Caxton's edition of the Legend of St. Wenefrede, from the copy in Lambeth library, printed 1485 (?) But three copies of Caxton's edition exist—this one, one in the British Museum, and one in possession of Earl Dysart. St. Wenefrede, beheaded in the 7th century, was very popular in the 14th and 15th centuries, and in the beginning of the 15th century John Mirkus, of Lilleshul in Shropshire, narrated her life in his book 'The Festiall,' but this version seems to have been unknown to Caxton, who printed from a later MS. This 'Sermon on St. Wenefrede' from 'The Festiall' is also given by Horstmann. Then follow—II. Fifteen Legends of the Virgin; III. St. Dorothea, and IV. St. Jerome, all from a MS. in the Lambeth library.

J. Phelan, in his Reply to Mr. Furnivall's Couple of Protests, defends himself against Mr. Furnivall's strictures (Anglia II 504), the most serious of which was that he had rolled three Arthur Massingers into one. Mr. Phelan shows that it is at least probable that they were the same, the only argument advanced by Mr. Furnivall against this view being that 'these names occur in different places.' Mr. Phelan objects with good ground to the tone of Mr. Furnivall's criticisms. Pity 'tis that the *odium philologicum* bids fair to equal in tone the *odium theologicum*.

J. Zupitza has some Brief Notes on—1. Andreas, 145; 2. Andreas, 483; 3. Alfred's Proverbs, ed. Morris, 118, 264, and Hending, ed. Bøddeker, 293, 133; 4. Chaucer, C. T. Prologue, 52; 5. Chaucer, C. T. Prologue, 169; and 6.

A supposed misprint in his *Uebungsbuch* XXIV 110, attributed to him by Kölbing II 283.

Under 'Bemerkungen und Nachtraege'—1. W. Sattler on Lohmann's *English Relative Pronouns* (*Anglia* III 1, 115) supplies additional examples of the omission of the relative in modern writers, and takes exception to Lohmann's remark on the rare omission of the nominative in writers of the present day, but it is noteworthy that nearly all of Sattler's examples occur in sentences with 'it is,' 'there is,' and their variations, which permit conciseness in speech, and outside of these Lohmann's remark is quite true. 2. J. Zupitza, on Middle-English *þ* for *ð*?, thinks it merely a misprint (or miswriting) in all of Strattmann's examples (*Englische Studien* III 14). Why not? since modern printers frequently put *þ* for *p* (*thorn*) and even for *p* (*wen*). 3. H. Varnhagen suggests for the etymology of *catch*, *F. cacher*, hence *cachen*, confused with *chacen*, *O. F. chacier*, rather than as Skeat and others, *q. v.* 4. M. Trautmann, on the Northumbrian *ɾ*, corrects a statement made in *Anglia* III 1, 215, that this sound is spreading. Dr. J. A. H. Murray and another writer have informed him otherwise.

In the Book Notices R. Köhler reports on the Publications of the Folk-lore Society, I, n. d., which was established in 1878. G. Schleich reviews at some length J. Neuhab's Göttingen Doctor-dissertation entitled 'The Old-English Cato,' a translation and paraphrase of the *Disticha Catonis*, Berlin, 1879. Miss L. T. Smith notices Arber's *English Garner*, Vols. I, II, London, 1877, 1879; and H. Varnhagen certain Spanish prose texts, entitled 'Dos Obras Didacticas y dos Leyendas sacadas de manuscritas de la Biblioteca del Escorial,' Madrid, 1878, published by the Society of Spanish Bibliophiles and edited by H. Knust. Varnhagen notices it here because Knust's statements about the Middle-English versions of the second story, the Legend of Placidus Eustachius (St. Eustache), are incomplete. R. P. Wülcker reviews briefly G. Schleich's Berlin Doctor-dissertation, entitled 'Prolegomena ad carmen de Rolando Anglicum,' Burg, 1879. L. Proescholdt discusses E. Hermann's 'Shakespeare the Polemic,' Erlangen, London and New York, 1879, the polemical passages being found in *M. N. D.* and *Tempest*; and M. Trautmann notices F. A. Leo's 'Four Chapters of North's Plutarch,' London and Strasburg, 1878. This number closes with Mr. Furnivall's Prospectus of the Epinal MS. Facsimile, the oldest Anglo-Saxon document, being of the 7th century, and Miss Smith's of the Philological Society's New English Dictionary, of which Dr. J. A. H. Murray is the editor, who wants help; address Mill Hill, Middlesex, N. W., England.

III.—H. Varnhagen continues his contributions to Middle-English Poems with—VIII, *Lay le Freine*, from the Auchinleck MS., heretofore published by Ellis and by Weber. Varnhagen says the original dialect is not determined, but from the evidence of forms we should not go far wrong, I think, in placing it near the southern border of the East-Midland district. He also prints from a MS. lately rediscovered by Professor Zupitza in the Worcester Library—IX, A Fragment of the twelfth century, consisting of twenty-two lines, first printed by Sir T. Phillips in his *Fragments of Aelfric's Grammar*. The contents of the original are uncertain; some of the scholars of England, as Beda, Aelfric and certain bishops, are mentioned in the fragment.

P. Hennig contributes the longest article, over sixty pages, on the Relation of Robert Southey to Lord Byron. The first half is taken up with an account of Southey's life, and the second investigates the quarrel between the two. The author thinks that justice requires that this matter should be made clear to posterity, because Southey is now known more through Byron's attacks than through his own works. This is hardly the case, but if Southey needed vindication he has received it. Certainly Byron does not appear in a creditable light, but the author thinks posterity should not complain, as Byron's *Vision of Judgment* was one of the fruits of the quarrel.

H. Gaebler supplies the weightiest article, on The Authorship of the Anglo-Saxon Poem of the Phoenix, another contribution to the Cynewulf-question. After a résumé of recent work on Cynewulf, Gaebler states the grounds on which Dietrich assigned the Phoenix to Cynewulf, and rightly thinks they were too slight to furnish decisive proof; so he sets himself to solve the question, and treats first of the *source* of the poem, comparing carefully the Latin poem *De Phoenix* of the sixth century, ascribed to Lactantius, with the A. S. Phoenix. The Phoenix contains 677 verses, the first 380 of which are enlarged from this Latin poem of 170 verses; the remainder is a Christian allegory not contained in the Latin. A comparison of the way in which the author deals with his original and Cynewulf's treatment of his sources, leads to the conclusion that we cannot deny the poem to Cynewulf on this ground. It should be added that only the acknowledged genuine poems of Cynewulf are used in the comparison. An examination of the *verse* and *language* follows next. As to the former, two points are presented, Cynewulf's preference for grammatical alliteration and his use of intentional rime, both of which are found in the Phoenix. As to the latter, a careful study of the words and phrases is made, for on these the chief weight is laid in the proof of authorship. Many words are found in the Phoenix and in Cynewulf which either do not occur elsewhere or occur proportionately seldom; this applies especially to compounds. The study of the phraseology also shows many expressions common to Cynewulf and the Phoenix. The result of this examination, then, makes it probable that Cynewulf wrote the Phoenix. A study of the allegorical portion of the Phoenix increases this probability. A passage of Ambrosius furnishes the basis for the Christian allegory; also one in Bede. An examination of the representation of the last judgment in the Phoenix and in the Christ and the Helena enables us even to determine the place of the Phoenix among Cynewulf's works, namely, soon after the Christ and before the Helena.

J. Zupitza furnishes the results of his collation of the two MSS. of Salomon and Saturn with Schipper's text in the *Germania*, XXII 50, and Sweet's corrections of Kemble's text given in the *Anglia*, I 150. He also supplies the Latin text of a receipt for money dated Oct. 2, 1446, in which Lydgate's name appears.

H. Varnhagen continues his *Middle-English Poems with—X*, two texts of the *Signa ante Judicium*, one from MS. Camb. Univ., Ff. II 38, and the other from MS. Cott. Calig., A II. The texts vary considerably from each other, but which is the older is not determined.

F. H. Stratmann gives many examples of the Paragoge *n* in Layamon, and

concludes that *n* was dropped from or added to the end of a word at will, and that an assumption of false *n*-stems is not to be thought of.

In the Book Notices J. Koch contributes an appreciative notice of A. W. Ward's *Chaucer in the English Men of Letters series* (London, 1879). He rightly thinks that Ward should not have modernized the spelling in his quotations, and sums up his opinion of the work as a whole that, while it has little significance for 'science,' it will certainly accomplish its object in wider circles, and scholars should be thankful that the latest results have been popularized in so excellent and concise a view.

L. Proescholdt notices K. Elze's *Notes on Elizabethan Dramatists* (Halle, 1880); D. Asher, Dr. Ingleby's *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, second edition, revised with many additions by Lucy Toulmin-Smith (New Shakspeare Society, Series IV, No. 2); and F. G. Wershoven's *Technical Vocabulary, English and German* (Leipzig, 1880).

H. Varnhagen reviews at length G. Kleinert's dissertation on the Dispute between Body and Soul (Halle, 1880).

M. Trautmann has a commendatory notice of Lounsbury's *History of the English Language* (New York, 1879), but while approving of its plan and treatment in general, he thinks it has "much that is wrong or not to be approved" in particulars. As instances he cites the classification of *fly* with the reduplicating verbs, the failure to distinguish between such verbs as *sittan* and *brecan*, writing the reduplicating preterites with *eð*, and the A. S. *ea*, *eo*=Gothic *au*, *iu*, as *ed*, *eo*, and assuming *those* to be derived from *pð* rather than from *pðs*, Trautmann's objection to which is certainly valid. He takes exceptions also to Lounsbury's division of the periods of English speech, but until the advocates of "Old English" are better agreed as to what it shall designate, we might as well hold on to "Anglo-Saxon" and "Early English."

R. P. Wulcker reports the contents of Kölbing's *English Studien*, II Bd. 2 Heft. (Heilbronn, 1879), and the volume closes with A. H. Bullen's Circular of his Reprints of rare Elizabethan Plays, Poems and Prose Tracts, beginning with the Six Plays of John Day; and F. J. Furnivall's Prospectus of his Proposed Edition of Shakspeare in Old Spelling. Every student of Shakspeare will thank Mr. Furnivall for undertaking this edition, and it is to be hoped that he will receive subscriptions enough to justify it.

The report of the *Anglia* is now brought up to date, and will be continued as the successive numbers appear.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

---

ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. XXXIV  
Band (1880).

I Heft.

1. Zur Pehlevi Münzkunde. Von A. D. Mordtmann. This article, treating of the coins of the Sassanidae, is the final account of the late Dr. Mordtmann's numismatic researches (others are to be found in Vols. 8, 12, 18, 19, 29, 31 of



the ZDMG). After giving a table of numismatic Pehlevi alphabets, it describes in detail the coins of a number of princes, appends tables of the weights of Sassanian coins and of the Sassanian dynasty, from Ardeshir I, A. D. 226, to Yezdegird IV, A. D. 632-651, and concludes with a reply to Nöldeke's strictures on the author's derivation of the ending *kert* in Iranian names of places (see ZDMG, Vol. 33). Throughout there are interesting historical notices.

2. Short articles. H. L. Strack, in reply to Chwolson, shows that Abraham Firkowitsch had a sufficient motive for falsifying dates of Crimean tombstone-inscriptions and epigraphs, and Bible-texts (namely, to glorify the Karaite Jews, and save them from persecution by proving that they were not descended from the Palestinian Jews of Christ's time), that it was possible for him to do it, and that he actually did do it. C. H. Comill gives (as appendix to ZDMG 30, 454) a note on the monks Maximus and Dâmâtêwôs, mentioned in his publication of the confession of faith of Jacob Baradaeus. J. Gildemeister points out that the work published in 1829 by Flügel under the title "Vertrauten Gefährten des Einsamen von Ettseâlîbi," and ascribed by him and others to, an author Ettseâlîbi (El-thaâlîbi), is really an extract from the Anthology of Râghîb, which was published in Kâhira (Cairo) in 1868. Professor Sachau, under date of Dec. 27, 1879, gives a short account of his tour in the East, describing among other things a trilingual inscription at Zebed (a dedication to two saints), of which two of the languages were Greek and Arabic, and the third in a character wholly unknown to him. Theodor Aufrecht explains the strange form *yâmakî* in Kaushîtakibrâhmaṇa 27, 1, as a verbal form made by the diminutive ending *â*. Professor Fleischer describes a collection of Oriental silver found last year at the foot of the Horneboh mountain near Bautzen (Upper Lausitz), containing Sassanian coins, and throwing an important light on the mediaeval intercourse between Asia and Europe.

Anzeigen. Dr. S. Warren's edition of the Jaina Upâṅga Nirayâvaliyâsuttam, Amsterdam, 1879, is noticed by H. Jacobi, who welcomes it in view of the small number of Jaina texts published, but regrets the numerous abbreviations, the insufficient treatment of the text (the reviewer gives his own views of how Jaina texts should be edited), and the fact that the editor had not the aid of commentaries. The same scholar also reviews Dr. H. Oldenberg's edition of the Vinayapitaka (Vol. I, the Mahāvagga, London, 1879), which he characterizes as a very carefully prepared and valuable work; he agrees with the author in referring the origin of the Pali to the Dekkan coast, south of the Vindhya mountain-range, but dissents from his view of the date of the Buddhist sacred writings, holding that the connecting the Vinaya with the Council in Vesali brings us into a dilemma, and that sure results cannot be reached till the historical foundation, the first century after the Nirvâṇa, is better known. To Ferdinand von Richthofen's "China" (Vol. I, Introductory. Berlin, 1877) A. von Gutschmid accords very high praise as "a work of art in the department of historical-geographical literature," but maintains, against the author, the comparatively recent date of the book Yü-kung, dissents from his view that the substantial identity of the moon-stations among Chinese, Indians and Arabians is to be explained by regarding them as the common possession derived from the primitive time when Indians, Chinese and Accadians (the existence of these last Gutschmid thinks problematical) dwelt on the two sides of the Pamir, and



defends, also against the author, a modified form of the common opinion that the name "Cina" for China came overland from a Chinese people called Tain (he makes it the westernmost district of China, which finally gained control over the whole land). There is a short notice of Count Baudissin's *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte* (Hef. I, II, Leipzig, 1876, 1878) by E. Nestle, and one by Professor Fleischer of the first volume of the Catalogue of the German Oriental Society (Leipzig, 1880), containing the list of printed books, lithographs, photographs and similar matter, lately completed by Prof. Müller.

## II Heft.

1. Ueber den arabischen Dialekt von Zanzibar. Von Franz Praetorius. As the main characteristics of the dialect, Praetorius states that it is the vulgar Arabic of the cities of Syria, Egypt and the Magreb; the accent tends towards the beginning of the word, a short vowel in an open syllable often falls away, as in the Perfect, in the Imperfect a helping vowel is inserted which gives it the Ethiopic form (as *yesharbu* from *sharab*), when suffixes are added to the Perfect the tone is on the last vowel of the stem, and always on the last syllable of the third singular feminine, suffixes to the Imperfect act as the flexional endings; as to pronunciation, the third letter of the alphabet = *gy*, and the dotted *ṭ* is identical with the *ḍ* had; the pronominal suffix of the second singular feminine *sh*, out of *k*, as in Hadramaut and Amharic; "my father" is *abui*; before suffixes the *n* is retained in the dual, and sometimes in the masculine *pluralis sanus*; the Egyptian and Syrian *hal* and Egyptian *da, di* are not found; the relative pronoun is *illedhi*, not *illi*; the interrogations are *min* and *mu*; verbs middle and final *y* have lost their intransitive forms, and verbs final *w* are absorbed in the final *y* class; the Imperfect has mostly a present signification, the future is marked by prefixed *ha*, sometimes by *b*, as in Egyptian and Syrian. The Arabic settlement in Zanzibar went out from Oman towards the end of the seventh century of our era.

2. Kritische Bemerkungen zum "Sapiens Sapientium," in Dillmann's *Chrestomathia Ethiopica*, p. 108, 599. Von E. Trumpp. Gives a number of various readings from a MS. received by the writer from Abyssinia, with grammatical remarks and translations. Trumpp has a second article, *Zum Brief buch*, giving various readings to Praetorius' text of the Letter on the observance of the Sabbath, which is prefixed to most copies of the theological cyclopedia entitled *Hâyemânôt abawé* or Faith of the Fathers. This letter, which was said to have descended from heaven, is held by Trumpp to have been translated in Alexandria from the Arabic, and probably by the Patriarch Eutychius, 933-939.

3. Das Kâlakâcârya-Kâthânakam. Von Hermann Jacobi. Gives the text of a Prâkrit recension, after the only MS., with translation and glossary. Jacobi thinks this older than the Sanskrit recension, and assigns as the lower limit for its date 1428 A. D., but holds that it is not the source of all other recensions; the name of the author is not given. The dialect is in the main what J. has called Jaina Mâhârâshṭri, characterized by the use of the dental *n*, when initial or doubled, of the *yaçruti*, and loan-forms from the Jaina Prâkrit. The little work belongs to the class of *miçra*, that is, it consists of prose and metrical parts. After stating the six parts into which it is divided, J. inquires into the

differences between this and the other traditions of the Jainas, and compares what appears to be historical in it with other sources. He holds that the lists of the Sthaviras rest on uncertain tradition, and that the same thing is true of the Jaina accounts, though these are not to be wholly rejected. The MS. used by him, now in the India Office Library, gives a fair text, but no helps for the interpretation. The book tells how the sage Kâlakâcârya brought about the overthrow of King Gardabhilla, who had carried off a nun, and how he regulated the affairs of the monks and dealt with disobedient pupils, how he had an interview with Indra, and finally, by abstaining from food, passed into a better world.

4. The Pravargja-Ceremonie nach den Âpastamba-Çrauta-Sûtra, mit einer Einleitung über die Bedeutung derselben. Von Richard Garbe. In his introduction Garbe points out (after Weber) that the Pravargja or milk-ceremony was not essential to the Soma-offering, but rather the two combined presented the highest aim of the Indian sacrificial system, to lift the offerer up into the world of the gods. He holds it to have been an old Aryan ceremony; for the ancient Aryan people milk was the symbol of all fullness of divine favor, and, as it came warm from the cow, it seemed right that it should be offered warm to the god. For the text Garbe had four MSS. (three from the India Office Library, one from the Munich Royal Library), and for the commentary two (one from the India Office and one from Munich), only the last dated, 1786.

M. J. de Goeje denies the correctness of the form *esh-shâya'iyyun* in Lane's Arabic-English Lexicon, under the verb *sha'a* 5 and elsewhere, and gives reasons for holding that *esh-shi'iyyun* alone is correct. In a letter to Professor Nöldeke Professor W. Robertson Smith says, in criticism of Hommel's book, that bears, wolves and monkeys are found in the Hejâz.

Anzeigen. Ignaz Goldziher has a very favorable notice, with dissenting and complementary remarks, on Dr. A. Berliner's *Beiträge zum hebräischen Grammatik im Talmud und Midrasch*, Berlin, 1879. He thinks that Dr. B. sometimes finds grammar where there is nothing but a peculiar method of biblical exposition, for example, when he supposes that the Talmudists assumed the monosyllabic character of Hebrew roots. E. Kautzsch notices, without dissenting criticism, Baer & Strack's edition of the *Dikduke of Ben Asher*, Leipzig, 1879. Fleischer furnishes a long list of corrections, of orthography, text and translation, of Dr. Wilhelm Bacher's *Muslicheddin Sa'ad's Aphorismen und Sinngedichte*, Strassburg, 1879. Th. Nöldeke, Eb. Schrader and A. Weber reply to attacks made on them by Paul de Lagarde in the second part of his *Symmicta*, Göttingen, 1880; Weber's reply is crushing.

### III Heft.

1. Das dritte Capitel des *Vendidâd*. Von Wilhelm Geiger. The special object of the writer is to supplement Geldner's translation of this chapter (Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, XXIV 542) by collecting what can be gotten from the tradition. He regards the chapter (with Geldner) as a conglomeration of several different pieces, the kernel of the whole being a list of directions how to please the earth-deity, of which the text contains a double recension, the first comprising 1-11, the second 12-13, 22-23, 34-35. The translation is accompanied by copious notes.

2. Nâsir Chusran's *Rûsanâinâma* oder Buch der Erleuchtung, in Text und Uebersetzung, nebst Noten und kritisch-biographischem Appendix. Von Prof. Dr. Hermann Ethé. This second part (the first appeared in ZDMG XXXIII 645-655) treats of the nature of God, the creation of the world and man and human character, and shows, with its ascetic teaching, considerable ethical elevation and insight into life.

3. Arabische Quellen zur Geschichte der indischen Medizin. Von August Müller. E. Haas, in ZDMG XXX 617-670, maintains that the Arabians knew nothing of the medical science of ancient India, though they may have got some knowledge of the later Indian medicine, which, under Greek influence, helped them to form their own science, and that the work called by the name of *Suṣṛuta* is derived from earlier sources, this name being made after the Arabic "Sokrat" (Socrates confounded with Hippocrates); against this Weber (Ind. Literaturg., 2 Nachtr. 13 f) holds that there is no reason for doubting the statements of the Arabic chroniclers, and that the linguistic character of *Suṣṛuta* is opposed to so low a date for the work. Müller, in order to help the solution of this question, examines all accessible Arabic accounts of Indian medicine, giving especially an annotated translation of the Twelfth Book of Ibn Abi Uṣeibi'a, and of the Arabic version of Sānāg's book on poisons. He sums up as follows:—1. While the *Fihrist* is trustworthy, Uṣeibi'a is to be used with great caution. 2. The Arabian citation of Indian works may suggest to Indologues a perfectly definite mode of critical treatment for their medical texts; thus it appears that works cited by the Arabians are not always the same as those now known by the same names (as in the case of the book called *Sesirid*). 3. It is a question how Indian medical literature came to the Mohammedans, whether through the Pehlevi or otherwise. 4. It appears that there arose a younger Arabic-Indian school of medicine, and the question arises as to the relations between it and the older.

4. Die hebräische Metrik. Von Dr. G. Bickell. I. In correction and completion of the hypothesis set forth in his *Metrices Biblicae Regulae* and elsewhere, Bickell here gives a list of variously constructed metrical passages in the Old Testament, and adds restitutions of Nahum i 2-10 and Pss. ix, x, for the purpose of bringing out the alphabetical arrangement of the stichoi. In the case of Nahum it is a very complicated and artificial system that he finds, and throughout his text-changes are often arbitrary.

Professor Sachau continues the sketch of his Eastern travel, from December 27th to his return April 26th. He met with many hindrances from famine and cold. The greater part of what he brings back relates to the geography of northeastern Syria, the regions of the rivers Balikh and Khâbûr, Mount Masius, etc. He promises to make public soon his archaeological and epigraphic material, and states that he was able to secure in Mosul and among the Nestorians east of the Tigris a number of Syrian MSS., among which are some written on parchment, tolerably old.

Prof. Dr. G. Hoffmann writes, in reference to his *Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischen Märtyrer*, that his geographical results agree surprisingly with those of Sir Henry Rawlinson's paper in *Proceedings R. G. S.*, March, 1879, and that his opinion that the fever of Ganzak was *Gusnasfpfever*, not

Gusaspfever, is supported by the readings Gūsnasp and Vēsasp in West's Pehlevi Texts, Oxford, 1880.

Fleischer vindicates to Julius Fürst (*Chald. Gram.*, Leipzig, 1835), the first explanation of מנרעם (against a statement in W. Wright's *Facsimiles of Ancient Manuscripts*, Plate LXIV, London, 1880).

Anzeigen. Th. Nöldeke contributes various readings (from a Göttingen MS. which agrees with the Oxford rather than with the Brit. Mus. MS.) and grammatical corrections to Martin's excellent edition of Bishop Severus' work on Syriac Metric (*De la Métrique chez les Syriens*, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, VII 2), and offers explanations of some obscure passages in Severus' crude but useful book. Fleischer gives an account of Bistani's Arabic Encyclopedia, now going through the press, which he regards as an event of world-historical importance, representing, as it does, the scientific union of the Orient and the Occident. The Encyclopedia is to consist of twelve or fifteen volumes, of which three have appeared, and is to embrace all branches of learning, drawing its material from eastern and western sources; it is well provided with indexes for the benefit of the European reader. The preface to the first volume states that the Porte had promised financial aid, and that the Khedive of Egypt had subscribed for a thousand copies of the work. G. Th. Reichelt furnishes a notice of the missionary H. A. Jäschke's Tibetan and English Dictionary, which he represents as far superior to its predecessors in extent of vocabulary, in scientific character and in typography; it was printed at the Unger house in Berlin, and the types are such, says R., as have never before been seen in Asia or in Europe. Alfred von Gutschmid, in his notice of Nöldeke's *Geschichte des Artachsir*, after remarking on the high scientific character of this the first translation of a great Pehlevi work ever attempted without the aid of written or oral tradition, adds that the work is a historical romance, and that the story of the founder of the Sasanian dynasty is the same as that of Cyrus as given by Ctesias—that it is, in fact, an old Persian national legend. Victor von Strauss announces the publication of his translation and exposition of the *Schi-king*, Heidelberg, 1880.

C. H. Toy.

---

BEITRÄGE ZUR GESCHICHTE DER DEUTSCHEN SPRACHE UND LITERATUR,  
herausgegeben von PAUL und BRAUNE. VII Band. Heft I und II.

The first article is a Leipsic dissertation, expanded until it takes up more than half of the first *heft*, on "The dialects of the old Low Saxon territory between the years 1300 and 1500, represented from original documents." It is inspired by Braune's treatises on Veldeke and his dialect in the "*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*," vol. IV, and "*Zur Kenntnis des Fränkischen*" in the very first number of these *Beiträge* (1874). Braune had worked up the phonology of "Mittelfränkisch" (his name for the less definite "Niederrheinisch") between 1250 and 1400; had shown its relation to the Low German dialects, and tried to define its geographical limits. Heinzel in his "*Geschichte der niederfränkischen Geschäftssprache*" (Paderborn 1874) had treated very fully



of those Frankish dialects which are Low German and still show *v* for *b* and *t* for *z*. Tümpel, the author of this essay, now treats of the Low Saxon group, but limits himself to local records and histories, and does not draw from general literature as Heinzel and Braune did. Tümpel's work is very elaborate and formal, like all dissertations. It is divided into chapters and paragraphs, phonology, inflection; gives list of sources and records; has a table of contents, summary of results, two appendices and two maps. As a collection of material Tümpel's article has considerable value, but as he himself acknowledges, his work is only preparatory. His own summary of results is unsatisfactory. On p. 95 he says, that if we are to divide the language of our territory (between the Rhine and the Elbe) into dialects, we can distinguish a Northwestern, Southwestern, etc., and then he illustrates by maps. But who would be so unreasonable as to ask him to draw an exact, or even any map whatsoever of the Low Saxon dialects of the year 1300 A. D.? Does not the last edition of Kiepert's Sprachkarte Deutschlands put Cologne north of the Low German line? All that the writer can claim as a geographical result of his investigations is, that within the last five hundred years Middle German has slightly encroached upon Low German territory. Again and again the writer confesses, in so many words, until the living dialects of that region are investigated we cannot decide this question. But will not dead records keep better than living dialects? Unfortunately the town records of Hoya and Diepholz, Duderstadt and Dortmund, do not decide whether Middle Low German long and short *o* and *u* are capable of 'umlaut' (p. 32). Various marks occur over all vowels in the MSS., and it is doubtful whether they are meant to denote 'umlaut,' length or diphthong, or are merely copyist's whims. Upon the 'vocalnachschatz' of five hundred years ago Tümpel cannot throw light, but he might know that this extraordinary phenomenon is called a diphthong nowadays.

Paul continues his "Contributions to the history of sound-development and form-association," and gives five numbers more. No. 4 is a minute exposition of the West-Germanic consonant-lengthening or gemination, produced by a following *j*, *r*, *l* or *w*. Scherer saw in this process an assimilation of *j* to the preceding consonant. Holtzmann (Altd. Gram. p. 169) showed that the geminations before *j*, *r*, *l* and *w* are parallel, and Sievers explained them all by the circumflex ('circumflektirende Betonung'). See these Beiträge V, p. 161, and Sievers' Lautphysiologie p. 131. Paul now treats very fully the effect of *j* upon the preceding consonant, for which the material had not been collected as for *r*, *l*, *w*. He asserts the universality of the lengthening and accounts for nearly all exceptions. Pages 128-132 are nearly filled with footnotes on 'lautphysiologie.' It is the fashion now for philologists to go into this subject, and their alpha and omega is Sievers' work, which is radically wrong on the principle of surdness and sonancy. If Sievers sets up a 'tonlose Verschlusslenis' (= surd sonant stop), Paul asks, is not a 'tönende Verschlussfortis' (= sonant surd stop) possible? Of course it is. One is as possible as the other, but at the same time as monstrous and as absurd as the other.

No. 5 concerning the weak preterit and participle, connects with Begemann's "Das schwache Praeteritum der germanischen Sprachen" (Berlin, 1873). B. had shown that the number of weak preterits without connecting vowel (*i*) had been larger in General Teutonic than in Gothic, but he had drawn wild con-



clusions from his discovery. Paul counts up six criteria by which the original lack of the connecting vowel is established and applies them to the various dialects. He finds that even some verbs of the second weak declension (O. H. G. *-en*) never had a connecting vowel. The origin of the weak preterit turns upon the question, does the Germanic dental correspond to Parentspeech *t* or *dh*? In his opinion to *dh*, and then he solves all difficulties with the help of Verner's Law and form-association between preterit and participle.

No. 6 on Gothic *ai* and *au* is mainly polemical and speculative. Holtzmann claimed that they were short. Brugman lately agreed with him. Kluge tried to refute these two and Sievers, Kluge. Paul now attacks Sievers' theory and proposes a new one which is in part Leo Meyer's. Who is ready with a novel one for Paul's?

No. 7 illustrates the dropping of *j* and *w* before *i* and *u* respectively.

No. 8 adds a restriction to the Old Norse rule: no 'brechung' after *v*. This holds good only before double consonants. Before a single consonant *eo* became *o*: *v* vanished before *o*, hence *o* from *veo*.

The last article is by Kögel on some Germanic dental-compounds, viz. *ss* and *st*. For *ss* he proves:—(1) that the second *s* is due to one of the accented suffixes *-td*, *-th*, *-tū*; (2) that the first *s* can never go back to a Parentspeech spirant; (3) *ss* stood in General Teutonic always between vowels, counting *j* and *w* vowels after a long preceding syllable. Some very good etymologies are brought forward, e. g., of the prefix *mis-* in *misdeed* or *missetat* and in *misslich* or *misfar*. *st* between vowels is due either to original *s* + *t* suffix, when it is unchangeable, or to a stop + *t*, e. g. in second pers. sing. pret. ind.

Heft II. Half of it is taken up by Mogk's investigations of the Gylfaginning. It is the second installment, dealing only with the sources of the Gylfaginning and its relation to the 'so-called' Edda songs. Of course a discussion of the character and manuscripts of the elder Edda is involved. Mogk sides in the main points with Bugge. According to these two authorities the author of Gylfag. did not know a collection of songs like the Cod. Reg., but the Voluspa, Grímnismál and Vafthrútnismál were nevertheless his chief sources. Mogk's inferences as to the nature of these three songs as Snorri saw them seem certainly 'aus der Luft gegriffen.' Snorri tried to combine the substances of the three stories into one and smooth over the contradictions, but with ill success. On the whole he did not understand the old Edda much better than we do now. Some of its blindest strophes, upon which a ray of light would be so welcome, Snorri skipped. The other sources from which he drew for the Gylfag. were popular belief, Skald poetry, and his own brain. The appendix is on Ulfr Uggason, the famous Skald, author of the fragmentary Husdrapa, which Mogk finds no difficulty in reconstructing entire.

Another very long article is on Heinrich von Morungen, by E. Gottschau. We did not know before that this Minnesinger was of so great importance, but as the writer gives in an appendix a division of the Minnesong before Walther into three periods based upon a nice analysis of rhyme and metre, we suppose this was his chief end. Gottschau locates Heinrich in Thuringia.

Illustrations and applications of Verner's Law are still in vogue. Noreen brings forward new examples in addition to Osthoff's and Paul's, showing that not merely consonant stems but also *a-* and *o-* stems were subject to double accentuations in General Teutonic. His best illustrations are *hauho- haughó; gláso-, glazó; táhro- taghro*. Tamm has a note on Icelandic *nur* and *ǫr*. It is supposed by some that *nn* before *r* passed into *ǫ*; by others that *nur* passed into *ndr*, into *dr*, into *ǫr*. Tamm denies the possibility of any such transition. Where *ǫr* and *nur* are parallel forms, *ǫr* is the older and *nur* the later form, which owes its existence to the preponderance of the very frequent forms with *nn* for *nth* without *r*. *ǫ* for *nth* is the rule in Anglo-Saxon and Old Saxon. But in Icelandic *nth* became *ǫ* only when followed by *r*. This is very good so far, but where *ǫr* and *nur* do not come from G. T. *nth* Tamm has to assume form-association. For *maǫr* and *mannr* he supposes G. T. *manus*, Skr. *manus*. Kuhn had long ago assumed an *nn* for *nu*.

A note by Cosijn on *gethawenian* defends Holtzmann's view, questioned by Paul, that short *a*, *e*, *i* are 'broken' before *w*. Among Paul's examples was *gethawenian*, which Cosijn shows is a *vox nihili*. Grein corrected 'gethawened' into 'gethawenod' with an infinitive 'gethawenian.' Cosijn corrects into 'gethawaened,' which really occurs.

H. C. G. BRANDT.

ALEMANNIA. Zeitschrift für Sprache, Litteratur und Volkskunde des Elsasses, Oberrheins und Schwabens, herausgegeben von DR. A. BIRLINGER. Bonn, 1880. VIII Band. Heft I-III.

The contributors to this journal are few, the majority of the articles being by the editor and W. Crecelius. They are none the worse on that account. In these three numbers the contributions to folklore and literature preponderate over philological matter proper. The journal prints a great many scraps of literature hitherto unpublished; collects inscriptions, proverbs, phrases, poems and stories, all of which have their value in mythological and dialect work. Birlinger gives two numbers more from his commentary on Schiller's Wallenstein, which, we fear, will turn out rather 'Düntzerian,' when completed. Exceedingly interesting are further notes to the last edition of "Des Knaben Wunderhorn," by Birlinger and Crecelius. "Unsere Flussnamen," by R. Buck (Heft II, p. 145-185), is original and valuable. The river-names of Germany, Gaul, Britain, Spain and Italy consist of a word-stem, generally a verbal stem and a derivative suffix, which is either a vowel *a*, *i*, *u*, but not often, or a consonant *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *s*, *v*, *c* and *d* (*t*). Any vowel may connect the consonant with the stem, e. g., the Weser was Wis-ara, Wis-era, Wis-ora and Wis-ura. The meaning of the stem, even if traced to an Indo-European root, is often conjectural.

Considering the fragmentary nature of much of the matter in the Alemannia, the value of the whole series will be greatly increased by the promised index to the eight volumes now complete.

H. C. G. B.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ORTHOGRAPHIE. Unparteiisches Centralorgan für die orthographische Bewegung im In- und Ausland. Unter Mitwirkung namhafter Fachmänner, herausgegeben von DR. W. VIETOR. Wiesbaden, 1880. No. 1.

If this journal, which is to appear monthly, can maintain itself, then the interest in orthography is greater than we supposed. Its aim is to furnish a means of communication between the various movements for spelling reform in Germany, Holland, France, England, the United States, Scandinavia and India. Hence it will have an international character. Prominent scholars in all these countries have promised their support. It will also give original articles. Such is Kräuter's in this number on "Schrift und Sprache" (to be continued).

Other articles are by Sanders, Wiebe, Sayce, T. H. de Beer (in Dutch) and E. Raoux (in French). The English, Dutch and French articles are also given in German.

H. C. G. B.

#### ROMANIA.

No. 32. *La vie latine de Saint Honorat et Raimon Féraut*. The appearance in 1875 of Sardou's edition of the Provençal life of Saint Honorat gave Paul Meyer occasion to compare the same with the Latin life of this saint, printed successively in 1501 and 1511. The result of this examination was the conviction that the Provençal, though bearing evidences of being a translation, could not have been translated from the Latin above mentioned, as there existed between the two so many discrepancies. One of two hypotheses would suffice to explain these discrepancies: either the Latin was modeled on the Provençal, or was an abridgment of a more ample life which Féraut had at his disposal (Romania V, p. 239). Meyer concluded in favor of the latter. Shortly after the publication of this article there appeared at Berlin a doctor's dissertation by S. Hosch, contesting Meyer's conclusion and defending the first hypothesis. Stengel in reviewing Hosch's thesis sided with Meyer (*Zeitschrift f. rom. Phil.* II, pp. 136-42). In August, 1878, by a singular coincidence and independently of each other, Messrs. Stengel and Meyer found each (the former in the Bodleian, the latter in the library of Trinity College, Dublin) a manuscript of the Latin Life of Saint Honorat. A comparison of these manuscripts with the impression of 1501 showed that the latter was only an abridgment, as Meyer had supposed, of a longer work which Féraut had at his command and which he translated quite faithfully. The Dublin manuscript belongs to the close of the XIIIth or beginning of the XIVth century; that at Oxford, a description of which may be seen in the *Zeitschrift f. rom. Phil.* II, p. 584, was executed in 1449. After describing the Dublin manuscript Meyer gives extracts from it, comparing them with the Catalan translation in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, with the Latin abridgment of 1511 and with the translation of Féraut, the whole intended to strengthen and prove his first hypothesis.

*La vie de Saint Grégoire le Grand*, ed. by A. de Montaiglon. The poem here given has nothing in common with the celebrated legend of Saint Gregory, the earliest French form of which, first printed by Luzarche, will be shortly edited

by Alfred Weber for the Société des Anciens Textes. This legend, it is true, bears the name of Gregory, but the person whom it concerns has not been identified with any of the popes of that name; whereas the poem above named relates the life of Gregory I, surnamed the Great, and is only a translation of the well-known work of Johannes Diaconus. It, together with a translation of the Dialogues of St. Gregory, is contained in a manuscript of the Bibliothèque d'Evreux, and was described by Chassant (*Mémoires de la Société de l'Eure*, 1847) in his notice of the poem *Advocacie Notre-Dame*, which he printed in book-form in 1857. This manuscript consists of 165 parchment leaves, written in double columns, dates from the first half of the XIVth century, and is from the hand of the Norman poet Guillaume Alexis, author of the *Blason des fausses amours*. Besides the Dialogue S. Gregore and Vie S. Gregore, it contains likewise *Advocacie Notre-Dame* and *Chapele de Baïex*. Of the Dialogue, Montaiglon prints only the prologue. He gives the Vie entire, which consists of 2378 lines in riming couplets.

*Contes populaires lorrains* recueillis dans un village du Barrois à Montiers-sur-Saulx (Meuse) is a continuation, by Emmanuel Cosquin, of a series of popular tales which he began to publish in volume V of the *Romania* (1876), and has continued at irregular intervals since that time. The whole series, when completed, will number about eighty. They were collected by himself and sisters in 1866-67, aided by a peasant girl whom he characterizes as remarkable for her intelligence and wonderful memory. Each *conte* is followed by a critical commentary, designed to point out its resemblance to other stories of a similar kind current in other countries. Many of them are traced to Oriental sources. The collection will be a valuable one for students of folk-lore, and it is to be hoped that the editor will make up his mind to bring them out in a more convenient shape. The present batch concludes with *Le loup et le renard* (No. 54).

*Notes sur la langue vulgaire d'Espagne et de Portugal au haut moyen âge* (712-1200), a notice of Ed. Wölfflin's lateinische und romanische comparison, of N. Caix's *Studi di Etimologia italiana e romanza*, and of R. J. Cuervo's *Apuntaciones criticas sobre el lenguaje bogotano*, and the *Périodiques* and *Chronique*, take up the remainder of this number, which closes the eighth volume of the *Romania*.

No. 33. *La Chanson du Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* is a long article devoted by Gaston Paris to an examination of this old French romance, which relates the adventures of Charlemagne in a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the strange feats which he and his paladins accomplished at Constantinople on their return. It is preserved in a single manuscript (British Museum, MS. 16 E. VIII) written in England in the XIIIth century by a copyist "qui savait à peine le français et qui a cruellement maltraité son texte." There are two extant translations of the poem from the XIIIth century, the one Norse (en Norvégien), the other Welsh (en Gallois), a notice of which may be seen in Koschwitz's *Karls des Grossen Reise nach Jerusalem und Constantinopel* (Heilbronn, Henninger, 1880). Also several 'remaniements' both in prose and verse were made of the story from the time of its composition down to the end of the XVth century. After giving a résumé of the chanson and referring briefly to the opinions of

Francisque Michel, Paulin Paris, P. Meyer, L. Moland, Léon Gautier and Koschwitz in regard to the date of its composition, and discussing and rejecting Fauriel's theory concerning Aimeri de Narbonne, M. Paris concludes in favor of a date anterior to that assigned to it by most of the commentators, and places it "à l'époque antérieure aux croisades, au troisième quart environ du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle." He regards the "style au sens purement littéraire" as perhaps the strongest argument for this conclusion. An examination of the language from a philological standpoint had induced Koschwitz also to refer it to the XIth century. Among other points of interest attaching to the *Chanson du Pèlerinage*, Paris states that we are justified in considering it as "le plus ancien produit de l'esprit parisien qui soit arrivé jusqu'à nous." It may be remarked, for the information of those interested, that M. Paris a few months ago reprinted (for private circulation only) this essay together with another, *Le Juif Errant*, from the *Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses*.

Traité catalans de grammaire et de poétique (suite).<sup>1</sup> IV.—Jaufré de Foxa. All that is known of Jaufré is to be gathered from his preface, where he says he composed his treatise at the request of Jacme, King of Sicily (eu, en Jaufres de Fuxa, per manament del noble e alt senyor en Ja., per la grasia de Deu rey de Sicilia, etc.) Jacme was on the throne of Sicily from 1286 to 1291, and from the latter date till his death in 1327 was King of Aragon. The importance of the text, here published for the first time, consists chiefly in this, that it shows the tendency of the Catalonians to assimilate their dialect to the Provençal. Until about the close of the middle ages they seem not to have had any definite appreciation of the individuality of their own language. The productions of their first poets are in Provençal. The little treatise of Raimon Vidal was adopted by them and furnished them a name, that of 'langue limousine.' By this title they designated their literary language in contradistinction to the popular speech, which enjoyed and still enjoys a popularity much greater than that attained by the *patois* north of the Pyrenees. They likewise adapted to their own use the grammatical compositions of the school of Toulouse, several of which have only been preserved by them. Still, while for certain special points treated by R. Vidal, as for instance the declension, they observed the Provençal rules, in other respects they wrote naturally in their own idiom, not seeming to be aware that they were departing from the pure Limousin of the *Reglas de trobar*. The language of Jaufré de Foxa, in spite of its Provençal tendencies, is pure Catalan. Pretending that the *Reglas* of Vidal are too learned for the uneducated (among whom he enumerates emperors, kings, counts, dukes, marquises, princes, barons and the bourgeois), he sets before him the task of giving rules "per que cells qui no s'enten en gramatica, mas estiers en [an?] subtil e clar engyn, pusquen mils conexer e apendre lo saber de trobar."

Études de phonologie espagnole et portugaise, by Jules Cornu. The object of this study is to show—(1) that *lege* and *rege*, not *leg* and *reg*, as Diez maintained, are the intermediate forms from which come *ley* and *rey*; this being shown by the existence of *lee* or *lêê* (= *le(g)e*) along with *ley* or *lei* and *rey* or *rei*, which are, in the majority of cases, dissyllabic in the Apolonio and Alexandre of Berceo; (2) whether the author of the Alexandre pronounced the third plu.

<sup>1</sup> See American Jour. of Philol., Vol. I, p. 113.



of the perfect *-ioron* or *-ieron*, and whether *ioron* belongs to the Leonese dialect; and (3) that (by examples taken from the *Cid*) *nos* and other enclitics were subject to the regular laws of phonetic change whenever they were fused with the words to which they were joined. The whole article is very unsatisfactory, and by no means conclusive.

Essai de phonétique roumaine, by A. Lambrior. Voyelles toniques. The examination is confined to the Latin element in the popular speech and in the early literary monuments beginning with the XVIth century. The Romanian makes no distinction between the Latin long and short *a*; it remains intact under the conditions indicated by the following examples:

fagum	<i>fag</i>	scalam	<i>scară</i>
nasum	<i>nas</i>	carnem	<i>carne</i>
laudare	<i>lăudare</i>	sal-salis	<i>sare</i>
partem	<i>parte</i>	talem	<i>tare</i>
mare	<i>mare</i>	caput	<i>cap</i>

Tonic *a* of the classic Latin, preceding *n* or *m* followed mediately or immediately by a consonant, is changed into an obscure sound, which will be here represented by *î* (in Diez by *u*). Examples: *romanum*, *romin*; *canto*, *cînt*; *quando*, *cînd*; *languidum*, *lînged*; *plangere*, *plîngere*; *canem*, *cîne*; *angelum*, *înger*; *sanguis*, *sînge*. But it often happens that *î* changes to *i* (lingual vowel) or to *u* (labial) according as we have in the body of the word lingual vowels or labial vowels and consonants, the change being caused by the influence of the consonants or atonic vowels on the tonic vowels; thus: *anima*, *înimă*, *inima*; *glandem*, *ghînde*, *ghinde* (now *ghindă*); *molliando*, *muiînd*, *muiind*, *muind*. Sometimes an atonic *î* observes the same law as the tonic *î*, as for instance: *supracîlia* *suprancîlia*, *sprîncene* *sprîncene*. In some words, also, tonic *î* has not been changed into *i*; but by the influence of the final atonic *a* *i* has been intercalated: *panem*, *pîne* alongside of *pîne*; *canem*, *cîne cîne*; *mane*, *mîne*, *mîne*; *mani* (=pl. *manus*), *mîini* *mîni*.

This influence of the lingual vowels (*i*, *e*) on the obscure *î* cannot be very old, as we find words in the old authors in which *î* has not yet become *i*; as: *grîndină* now *grîndînă*; *demîneată* (often *demîneată*), now *demineată*, etc. Observe also that this tendency to modify *î*, through the influence of a lingual vowel in the body of the word, is still active, especially in Wallachian: e. g. Lat. *plangit*, *sanguis*, *frangit*; Mold. *plînge*, *sînge*, *frînge*; Wal. *plînge*, *sînge*, *frînge*.

Just as the lingual vowels effect the change of *î* to *i*, so the labial vowels cause *î* to go over into *u*: *ambulo*, formerly *îmbîlu*, now *umblu*, and *angulus*, *îngîhiu*, now *unghîă*. An *î* may likewise be derived from a classic Latin *i* (=Romance *e* followed by *n*). For example, the preposition *in* becomes *în*; but in compounds, where it is followed by consonants or labial vowels, the *î* appears as *u*: *in* *impleo*, *în* *flu* *unflu* and *î* *mplu* *umplu*.

The remainder of the article is taken up with a discussion of certain apparent exceptions to the phonetic law of *a*+*n*, as seen in the suffixes *-man*, *-andru*, *-an*. After an ingenious argument (too long to be reproduced here), in which the *pros* and *cons* of both sides are fairly and squarely canvassed, the author thinks that *-man* and *-andru* (which could not come from the Latin, as it had no such suffixes) are to be regarded as derived from foreign words and proper names (giving numerous examples to prove this); further, that *-an* also is probably not

Latin *-anus* but of the same origin as *man* and *andru*; and that word-formations with these three suffixes were effected at a time when the law of the transformation of Latin *dn* into *in* was no longer operative. He is very modest, however, and appeals to "savants compétents" for their opinion on the evidence adduced.

The *Mélanges* of this number (occupying over twenty pages) is mostly devoted to etymological discussions by Cornu, Ulrich, Joret, Meyer and others.

The *Comptes-Rendus* contains a very severe criticism by Paul Meyer on Aug. Scheler's *Trouvères belges du XII au XIV siècle* (Bruxelles, 1876). Having poured out upon him the vials of his wrath, in regard to the slovenly performance of his work in editing the first series, he then turns him over to Gaston Raynaud, who is scarcely less harsh in his notice of the *Nouvelle Série* (Louvain, 1879). Gaston Paris notices very favorably Joseph Herz's *De Saint Alexis*, and Paul Meyer J.-P. Durand's *Études de philologie et linguistique aveyronnaises*.

SAMUEL GARNER.

## NECROLOGY.

We copy from the Boston *Daily Advertiser*, by permission of the author, Prof. William Everett's tribute to the memory of the late Frank Eustace Anderson, whose death was deplored by many who had not the privilege of knowing personally this gifted and enthusiastic scholar:

### THE LATE PROFESSOR ANDERSON.

Our issue of Saturday announced the death at Leipsic, on the 15th instant, of Professor Frank Eustace Anderson. No particulars have as yet transpired, but his friends have known for many months that his health was greatly enfeebled. The loss of so brilliant a scholar, who has so far from accomplished his career, cannot go unnoticed.

Professor Anderson was born in November, 1844, at Goff's Falls, N. H. His family was of Scotch-Irish descent, and his father was known for many years in Boston as one of our most energetic and upright business men, the senior partner in the house of Anderson, Heath & Co. Mr. Anderson was a pupil at the Roxbury Latin school, under Professor A. H. Buck. He entered Harvard College in 1861 with a reputation already formed as a sound and brilliant scholar. He was exposed to very severe competition, and graduated among the highest in 1865, with a very exceptional record for Greek scholarship. He then entered Trinity College, Cambridge, England, where his talents at once asserted themselves. It is unquestionably through him that the Hellenists of England first became aware of the immense addition to their resources made by Professor Goodwin, and convinced of serious defects in their own training. Mr. Anderson's single-hearted devotion to classical study was somewhat weakened by the fascinating social atmosphere of Trinity, and he paid much attention to the philosophical and social problems of the day, as investigated in the famous club of the Cambridge "Apostles." He took his degree at Cambridge in 1869 and then studied some time at Heidelberg and Berlin. In 1870 he was appointed tutor, and in 1873 assistant professor, at Harvard College. His teaching gave a new and powerful impulse to Greek study. It was absurd to call Greek as taught by him a dead language. It was alive, not through any gushing aestheticism, or uncritical perusal; but alive because taught thoroughly, and brought in all its parts—critical, grammatical, literary, historical—right to the inmost minds of his pupils. But while all his teaching was excellent, if we must select something in his instruction as specially stimulating and solid, it would be the method in which he handled Plato, and of Plato, the Symposium. He was also active outside of the class-room; active in forming and carrying out intelligent schemes for increasing the usefulness of the college, and active as a genial and sympathizing friend to the students. But the devotion to his studies and his friendships was too close for his health, whose laws he sadly

disregarded, though with a constitution naturally weak. He was obliged to make frequent visits to Europe, which he enjoyed intensely, but with little gain; and the corporation were obliged to accept his resignation in 1878. Since then he has lived chiefly at Leipsic, pursuing his favorite studies, but with constantly failing health. His death leaves Harvard College weaker by a most loyal son and servant, and inflicts an irreparable loss on American scholarship, which it was his constant aim to enrich from the best stores of other lands and times.

W. E.

Quincy, July 17, 1880.

*εἰς τὸν ἀκαίρως τεθνηκότα Φραγκίσκον Εὐστάχιον Ἀνδέρσονα.*

*ἦ ῥα φίλος τέθνακε διδάσκαλος; ἦ ῥα μαθητὰς  
 φίλτατος εἰς Ἀῖδα σῖγα βέβακεν ὁδόν,  
 Εὐστάχιος, τὸν Ἀθηναία ποτ' ἐφώπλισεν αὐτὰ  
 ᾧ σοφία, κρατερὸν γηγενέσιν πολεμῆν;  
 οὐ μάλα δὴ τέθναχ'· ἱερὰ κατὰ γαῖα καλύπτει  
 εὐσταχυν ἐς καρπὸν σπέρμα θαλυσόμενον.*

Γ. Ε.

---

SAMUEL STEHMAN HALDEMAN,

Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Pennsylvania, and Ex-President of the American Philological Association, died at his home, Chickies-Lancaster Co., Pennsylvania, on Friday, September 10th, 1880, in the sixty-ninth year of his age.

Professor Haldeman was of Swiss descent, in the fourth generation, his great-grandfather having been the founder of the family in this country. In him was found the somewhat unusual combination of great attainments in both physical and linguistic science; his works on various zoological subjects, in French and English, having won him distinction before he turned his studies to philology; after which time his labors were shared between the two.

In 1849 he published "Some Points in Linguistic Etymology," which at once gave him a high place among philological scholars. It was followed in 1851 by "Elements of Latin Pronunciation," in which he strongly advocated that reform which is now so widely adopted. In 1856 appeared his work on the "Relations of the English and Chinese Languages."

In 1858 his masterly treatise on "Analytic Orthography" gained for him over eighteen competitors the higher of two prizes offered by Sir William C. Trevelyan "for essays on a reform in the spelling of the English language," to contain, among other features, "an analysis of the system of articulate sounds."

His "Affixes to English Words," published in 1871, was everywhere recognized as one of the most thorough, well-digested, and scholarly pieces of work ever performed in the domain of etymology. His last published work in this department was his "Outlines of Etymology." He has left several works in manuscript; and at the time of his death was engaged in correcting the proofs of a "School Dictionary of the English Language," prepared in collaboration with an Associate of the Johns Hopkins University.

Professor Haldeman's works and monographs on Archaeology, Geology, Conchology, Entomology, and various branches of Zoölogy, are numerous, and are all marked by the thoroughness, logical reasoning, and independence of thought which were characteristic of their author.

In private life Professor Haldeman was one of the most amiable and genial of men, ever ready to help others and quick and grateful to acknowledge their help, and as accessible to the humblest student as to his equals in learning. To none could more accurately be applied that old note of the true scholar—

—gladly wolde he learne, and gladly teche.

None ever came to know him without being as much impressed with the simplicity and beauty of his character as with his talents and learning; and in losing him, American science has lost one of her best men in every sense of the word.

W. H. B.



## LANX SATURA.

The attention of the editor has been called more than once to the fact that before the jest of Ludi Magister in No. 2, p. 241 could have attracted any notice, the solecism '*me . . . persuasisti*' had been corrected into '*mihi*' by the author himself, and perhaps only a few copies had escaped the inspection of his critical eye and had reached uncritical America. Of course it gives the editor great pleasure to make this explanation, and to set down the slip to the large account of *typothetarum errores*. Still even typographical blunders ought to be noticed, when they are calculated to mislead the confiding. So in that well-known compendium by Nicolai (Griechische Literaturgeschichte, II 650) the following bibliographical note stands (or stood) under Plutarch's Moralia: 'englisch von S. Hands 1684.' Of course the printer was to blame for abridging 'several hands' and putting the initial letters in capitals. No mistake could have been more natural. But as 'Hands' is not an uncommon English name—there are two in Allibone's Dictionary of Authors—the mistake might mislead some person too desirous of 'completeness' and too prone to copy references without verification. Errors of a kindred nature are propagated in our best text-books, to the confusion of schoolboys, simply because no one is at the pains to point them out to the author or the publisher; and while a philological journal ought not to become a curiosity-shop of such matters, this periodical will not exclude corrections, especially of expensive books, such as dictionaries and encyclopaedias, which cannot be duplicated every year.

As for the other point on which Ludi Magister touched, it is but too evident that the American critic was hasty. In the words '*memineris velim quod haud raro sum expertus Hesiodeum ἄλλοτε μητρὸν πέλει ἡμέρη, ἄλλοτε μήτηρ*,' he was misled by the absence of punctuation to combine *quod* with *memineris* instead of making *Hesiodeum* the object and *quod* the relative. The editor admonished the unfortunate critic that such a model of prose composition as Plautus had combined the accusative of words as grand as *Hesiodeum* with *memini*, but Ludi Magister was too much wedded to Ciceronian usage to admit *memini* with *Hesiodeum* in the sense postulated. If the author had said '*Hesiodeum illud meministi*,' there would have been no trouble on his mind; but the *memineris velim* seemed to him to sin against Madvig's rule (§ 291, Ann. 1), which as a *Ludi magister* he was bound to respect.

Scarcely was the ink dry on this modest statement and confession when Ludi Magister came into the editor's office again, this time with Blaydes's *Lysistrata* in his hand, and there in the *argumentum* stands visible to every eye: *propositum sibi habet comicus cives suos reliquosque Graecos persuadere ut lites suas mutuas inter se componant*.

The only remedy I can see for this state of things is to have the printers put through an elementary course of Latin. It is more than suspected that many

illustrious writers of English owe their grammar and their orthography to the genii of the press, and we must go back to the old times when the *prote* was in some sort a scholar. To be sure Henri Estienne complained that one of these *semidocti* turned the *proci* into the *porci Penelopes*; but that was not as bad, in the circumstances, *pace Enni dixerim*, as construing *persuadere* with the accusative.

By the way, it is noteworthy that Nauck in his commentary on Phaedrus calls *persuadere aliquem* 'poetic syntax,' while Wölfflin (Phil. Anzeiger, 10, 1, 52) considers it 'archaic vulgar,' and himself directs attention to this difference of conception, as if the two did not often coincide.

Reading the scholia on Aeschylus' Septem, v. 83, in which an imaginary *ἐλεδεμνίως* or *ἐλεδεμνάς* is interpreted by *ἐλαύνων ἐμὲ ἐκ τῶν δεμνίων καὶ οὐκ ἔδῶν καθέσθαι, ἐλεδεμὰς ἢ ἐλοῦσα ἀπὸ τῶν δεμνίων*, I was reminded of a bit of modern etymology, which illustrates very forcibly the importance of being sure that you have a word before you begin to dissect it. A writer in the Deutsche Rundschau for May, 1877, enlarges on 'swallowag' thus: 'swallowag' ist nicht zu übersetzen, wohl aus *to swallow*, 'fressen,' 'verschlingen,' 'an sich reissen,' und *wag* 'galgenstrick' gebildet. For 'swallowag,' it may be necessary to tell our foreign friends, read 'scalawag.'

It would appear to be a law of nature that, whenever a man takes up his pen in defence of modern Greek pronunciation as applied to the ancient Greek, he should become more or less distracted, as it were. Geldart, for instance, in trying to show that *υ* was pronounced like simple *ι*, says (The Modern Greek Language, p. 28): "Homer nearly always makes *υλός* two short syllables," and Timayenis, with a studied change of wording, repeats (The Language of the Greeks, p. 161): "Homer almost always makes the *υ* in the word *υλός* a short syllable"! A rough count made *ἐν παρέργῳ* gives this result: In the Iliad (ed. Crusius), forms of *υλός* with short *υ*, nine (9); with long *υ*, four hundred and twenty-two (422); in the Odyssey, short, one (1); long, one hundred and seventy-seven (177). These figures can be varied slightly by adopting different readings in a few places, but the essentials are the same. Such are the men who are to teach us how to pronounce Greek!

M. W. H.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

### AMERICAN.

Thanks are due Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

Antoninus (M. Aurelius.) *The Thoughts of*, tr. by G. Long. 4to, 117-160 pp. *I. K. Funk & Co.* New York. Pap., 15 c.

Capes (W. W.) *Livy*. J. R. Green. 16mo, 119 pp. *Appleton*. New York, 1880. flex. cl., 60 c.

Demosthenes. *Philippics*, ed. by Frank B. Tarbell. 138 pp., 12mo. *Ginn & Heath*. Boston, 1880. Cl., \$1.15.

Demosthenes. *Symories, Megalopolitans, Rhodians*. By J. Flagg. 105 pp., 12mo. *Ginn & Heath*. Boston, 1880. Cl., \$1.15.

Dunbar (H., M. D.) *Complete Concordance to the Odyssey and Hymns of Homer*. 423 pp., 4to. *Macmillan*. New York, 1880. Cl., \$5.25.

Edkins (Jos.) *Chinese Buddhism*. 8vo. *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.* Boston, 1880. Cl., \$4.50.

Fisher (M. M.) *Three Pronunciations of Latin*. 2d ed. 157 pp., 12mo. *New England Pub. Co.* Boston, 1879. Cl., \$1.

Heilprin (Michael). *Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews*, tr. and crit. ex. Vols. I, II. 8vo. *Appleton*. New York, 1880. Cl., \$2.

Mallery (G.) *Introduction to Study of Sign Language among North American Indians*. 4to, pp. 75. *Washington*.

Martialis (Marcus Valerius). *Selected Epigrams*. By Rev. H. M. Stephenson. 16mo, 469 pp. *Macmillan*. New York, 1880. Cl., \$1.50.

Morris (C.) *Manual of Classical Literature*. 418 pp., 12mo. *S. C. Griggs & Co.* Chicago, 1880. Cl., \$1.75.

Morris (E. P.) *The Mostellaria of Plautus, with explanatory notes*. 181 pp., 16mo. *J. Allyn*. Boston, 1880. Cl., \$1.25.

Sophocles. *The Oedipus Tyrannus*, tr. into English verse by G. Volney Dorsey, M. D. 59 pp., 8vo. *Miami Pub. Co.* Piqua, O., 1880. Cl., 75 c.; pap., 50 c.

Xenophon. *Memorabilia of Socrates*, edited by S. R. Winans. 290 pp., 16mo. *J. Allyn*. Boston, 1880. Cl., \$1.50.

### BRITISH.

The following books are published in London unless otherwise indicated.

Aeschylus *Eumenides*, with brief English notes, by F. A. Paley. 18mo, 70 pp. *Whittaker*. 1s. 6d.

Aeschylus *Persae*. With brief English notes. By F. A. Paley (Cambridge Texts). 12mo, 64 pp. *Whittaker*. 1s. 6d.

Arnold (T. K.) *Eclogae Ovidianae*. New ed. 12mo, 101 pp. *Rivingtons*. 2s. 6d.

Chinshingura; or, *The Loyal League: A Japanese Romance*. Trans. by F. V. Dickens. New ed. Illust. Roy. 8vo. *W. H. Allen*. 10s. 6d.

Cicero *De Natura Deorum, Libri Tres*. With intr. and comm. by J. B. Mayor, with a Collation of several English MSS. by J. H. Swainson. Vol. I, 8vo, 290 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 10s. 6d.

Cicero *Laelius sive de Amicitia*. With Introduction and Notes by G. Long (Cambridge Texts). 12mo, 76 pp. *Bell & Son*. 1s. 6d.

Cicero. *Life and Letters: A New Translation of the Letters in Watson's Selection*. By G. E. Jeans. 8vo, 450 pp. *Macmillan*. 10s. 6d.

Cust (R. N.) *Linguistic and Oriental Essays*. 8vo, 490 pp. *Trübner*. 18s.

Davies (Benjamin). *A Compendious and Complete Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*. Revised by Edward C. Mitchell. 8vo, 778 pp. *Asher*. 12s.

Demosthenis *Orationes Publicae*. *The Philippics*. Edited by G. H. Heslop, M. A. New ed., Cr. 8vo, 121 pp. (Catena Classicorum). 3s.

Dutt (J. Chunder). *Kings of Kashmira: A Translation of Rajatorangini*, by Kahlana Pandita. 12mo, 260 pp. *Trübner*. 4s.

Euripides' *Bacchae*. With Crit. and Explan. Notes, and with Illustrations from Works of Ancient Art, by J. E. Sandys. Post 8vo, 318 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 10s. 6d.

Euripides' *Iphigenia in Taurus*. Ed. by A. Sidgwick. New ed. Fcap. 8vo, 53 pp. *Rivingtons*. 1s. 6d.

Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar*. Rev. and enl. by Edward C. Mitchell. 4th ed., 8vo, 450 pp. *Asher*. 7s. 6d.

Homer's *Odyssey*. Books I–XII. Trans. into English verse by Sir Charles Ducane. Roy. 8vo, 268 pp. *Blackwoods*. 10s. 6d.

Horace's *Epistles*. Book II., and *Epistola ad Pisones*; or, *Art of Poetry*. With English Commentary and Notes by the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox. 12mo, 86 pp. *Longmans*. 2s.

Horace. *Satires and Epistles*. By W. J. F. Vashon Baker, with Map. 18mo, 98 pp. *Macmillan*. 1s. 6d.

Jebb (R. C.) *Selections from the Attic Orators: Antiphon, Andokides, Lysias, Isokrates, Isaeos*. With Notes. 8vo, 400 pp. *Macmillan*. 12s. 6d.

Kamienski (Mieczislas). *Yadaste (The Wages): A Comedy*, translated by T. Louis Oxley. Cr. 8vo. *Kerby & Endean*. 1s.

Liddell and Scott's *Greek and English Lexicon*. *Longmans*. 18th ed., sq. 16mo, 7s. 6d.; 6th ed., 4to, 36s.

Lyall (C. J.) *Sketch of the Hindustani Language*. Post 8vo, sd., 56 pp. *Black (Edinburgh)*. *Longmans*. 1s.

Metcalfe (F.) *The Englishman and the Scandinavian. A comparison of Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse Literature*. 8vo, 526 pp. 1880. 21s.

Müller (F. Max). *A Sanskrit Grammar for Beginners*. 2d ed., Roy. 8vo, 312 pp. *Longmans*. 7s. 6d.

Plato. *The Trial and Death of Socrates: Euthyphron, Apology, Credo, and Phaedo*, trans. by F. J. Church. Post 8vo, 234 pp. *Macmillan*. 2s.

Pliny's *Letters*. Book III. With Commentary by J. E. B. Mayor. 12mo, 330 pp. *Macmillan*. 5s.

Plutarch's Lives. Trans. by A. Stewart and G. Long. Vol. I., 12mo, 482 pp. *Bell & Sons.* 3s. 6d.

Skeat (W. W.) An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. Part III. 4to, sd., 146 pp. *Clarendon Press* (Oxford). *Frowde.* 10s. 6d.

Smith (R. P.) Thesaurus Syriacus. Edidit R. Payne Smith. Vol. I., 4to, £5. 5s. Fasciculus V. 4to, sd. *Macmillan.* 21s.

Theocritus. Bion and Moschus. Rendered into English Prose. Post 8vo, 228 pp. *Macmillan.* 6s.

Thucydides II. With Collations of the Two Cambridge MSS., and the Aldine and Juntine Editions. By Richard Shilleto. 8vo, 150 pp. *Bell & Son.* 5s. 6d.

Wallace (Edwin). Outlines of the Philosophy of Aristotle. 8vo, 70 pp. *Parker.* 3s.

Whinfield (E. H.) Gulshan-I-Raz: The Mystic Rose Garden of Sa'd-ud-Din Mahmud Shabistari. The Persian Text, with English Translation and Notes. 4to. *Trübner.* 10s. 6d.

Zend-Avesta. Part I: The Vendidad. Translated by James Darmesteter. 8vo. *Clarendon Press.* 10s. 6d.

#### DUTCH.

Gallé (J. H.) Gutiska. Lijst van Gotische woorden, wier geslacht of buiging naar analogie van andere gotische woorden, of van het oud-germaansch wordt opgegeven. 8vo, 52 pp. Haarlem, 1880. 3m.

Van Eck (R.) Beknopte spraakkunst van het Maleisch, benevens opstellen ter vertaling, samenspraken en woordenboekje. 8vo, 219 pp. Breda, 1880. 5m. 30p.

#### ITALIAN.

Barone (Gius.) Epimenide di Creta e le credenze religiose de' suoi tempi. Studio-storico-critico-filologico. 8vo, 201 pp. Napoli, 1880. 3m. 60p.

Forcella (Vc.) Catalogo dei manoscritti relativi alla storia di Roma che si conservano nella Bibliotheca Vaticana. Vol. II., 8vo, 447 pp. Leipzig. *F. A. Brockhaus' Sortiment & Antiq.* Torino, 1880. 18m.

#### NORWEGIAN.

Rygh (O.) Norske Oldsager ordnede og forklarede, tegnede paa Trae af C. F. Lindberg. I Hefte. 4to, 15 pp. 2 Taf. u. 84 pp. Zeichnungen. Christiania, 1880. 24m.

#### SPANISH.

Rubio y Lluch (A.) Estudio crítico-bibliográfica sobre Anacreonte, y la coleccion anacreontica. 4to, 174 pp. Barcelona, 1879. 3m.

#### FRENCH.

De Baye (J.) L'Archéologie préhistorique. 8vo, 427 pp. Avec 59 illustr. et 5 planches. Paris, 1880. 20 fr.

Bergaigne (A.) Quelques observations sur les figures de rhétorique dans le Rig-Veda. Gr. in-8. *Vieueg.* 2 fr.

Bhavabhouti. Outtara-Rama-Charita. Drame de Bhavabhouti, traduit du sanscrit par Félix Nève. In-8. *Leroux.* Louvain. 7 fr. 50.



Bladé (J. F.) Proverbes, etc., recueillis dans l'Armagnac et l'Agenais. Texte gascon et traduction française. In-8. *Champion*. 8 fr.

Bosc (E.) Dictionnaire général de l'archéologie et des antiquités chez les divers peuples. 18mo, 584 pp. Avec 450 illustr. Paris, 1880. 8 fr.

Campano (Lr.) Diccionario general abreviado de la lengua castellana. 8vo, 1014 pp. Paris, 1880. 10 m.

Carletti (P. V.) Idh-Har-Ul-Haqq, ou Manifestation de la vérité de Rahmat-Ullah Effendi de Delhi. Traduction de l'arabe, etc., par P. V. Carletti. Vol. II. gr. in-8. *E. Leroux*. Edimbourg. 25 fr.

Charancey (H. de). Recherches sur les dialectes tasmaniens. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. Alençon. 2 fr.

Clairin (P.) Du Génitif latin et de la préposition DE; étude de syntaxe historique. In-8. *Vieweg*. 7 fr. 50.

Cust (Robert). Les Religions et les langues de l'Inde. In-18. *Leroux*. 2 fr. 50.

Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines, etc. Sous la direction de Ch. Daremberg et Em. Saglio. 5<sup>e</sup> à 7<sup>e</sup> fasc. 4to, à 2 col., 641—1120. Paris, 1880. Chaque fasc. 5 fr.

Dictionnaire historique de la langue française, publié par l'Académie française. Tome II., 2<sup>e</sup> partie. Affaire-Agricole. In-4. *Didot*. 4 fr. 50.

Études égyptologiques. Livraison 14-15-16. Chrestomathie démotique par Eug. Révillout, fascicules 2, 3, 4. In-4. *Vieweg*. Chaque livr. 25 fr.

Lespy (V.) Grammaire béarnaise. 2<sup>e</sup> édition. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 10 fr.

Lévêque (Eugène). Les Mythes et les légendes de l'Inde et de la Perse dans Aristophane, Platon, Aristote, Virgile, Ovide, Tite-Live, Dante, Boccace, Aristote, Rabelais, Perrault, La Fontaine. In-8. *Belin*. 7 fr. 50.

Lévy (B.) Les Langues mortes et les langues vivantes dans l'enseignement secondaire. In 8. *Hachette*. 1 fr.

Magio. Arte de la lengua de los Indios Baures conforme al manuscrito original del P. Antonio Magio, por Adam y Leclerc. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 15 fr.

Mélanges de linguistique et d'anthropologie, par Abel Hovelacque, Émile Picot et Julien Vinson. In-12. *Leroux*. 4 fr.

Mohl (Jules). Vingt-sept ans d'histoire des études orientales. Rapports faits à la Société asiatique de Paris de 1840 à 1868. Tome II. In-8. *Reinwald*. 7 fr. 50.

Philologie océanienne. Textes originaux, grammaires, vocabulaires, recueillis par les RR. PP. Maristes. I. Textes en langue Futana (îles Horn). In-8. *Leroux*. 2 fr.

Regnaud (Paul). La Métrique de Bharata, par Paul Regnaud. In-4. *Leroux*. 6 fr.

Regnaud (Paul). Le Dix-septième chapitre du Bharatiya-Natga-Castra, publié pour la première fois. In-4. *Leroux*. 3 fr.

Saadi. Le Bousthan ou verger. Poème persan, traduit en français, etc. A. C. Barbier de Meynard. In-12. *Leroux*. 10 fr.

Schapiro (Michel). Révélations étymologiques. Origines des mots dits historiques. I. Armes tranchantes. In-8. Odessa. *Maisonneuve*. 2 fr. 50.

## GERMAN.

- Adam (Dr. Ludw.) Die Odyssee u. der epische Cyklus. gr. 8, 132 S. Wiesbaden. *Niedner*. n. 3.
- Archimedis opera omnia cum commentariis Eutocii. Rec. latine vertit notisque illustravit Dr. J. L. Heiberg. Vol. I, 8, 511 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. 6.
- Archiv f. slavische Philologie. hrsg. v. V. Jagič. 5 Bd., 4 Hefte. gr. 8, I Hft., 180 S. Berlin. *Weidmann*. baar n. 20.
- Aristophanis comoediae. Annotatione critica, commentario exegetico, et scholiis graecis instruxit Frdr. H. M. Blaydes. Pars 2. Lysistrata. gr. 8, 334 S. Halle, *Buchh. d. Waisenh.* n. 6.—I. 2.: n. 11.
- Aristotelis ethica Nicomachea. Recognovit Franc. Susemihl. 8, 300 S. m. 1 Tab. Leipzig. *Teubner*. 1.80.
- Arndt (Dr. Otto). Üb. die altgermanische epische Sprache. Diss. gr. 8, 53 S. Paderborn. *F. Schöningh*. n. 1.
- Baumgartner (Adf.) Üb. die Quellen d. Cassius Dio. gr. 8, 61 S. Tübingen. *Laupp*. n. 1.
- Becker (Wilh. Adph.) Gallus. Neu bearb. v. Herm. Göll. 1. Thl. 8, 246 S. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 4.
- Beckurts (Ferd.) Zur Quellenkritik d. Tacitus, Sueton u. Cassius Dio. Diss. 8, 70 S. Altenberg. Jena, *Deistung*. baar n. 1.50.
- Benfey (Thdr.) Die Quantitätsverschiedenheiten in den Samhitā- u. Pada-Texten der Veden. 4. Abhandlg. 3. Abth. u. 5. Abhandlg. 2. Abthlgn. gr. 4. Göttingen. *Dieterich's Verl.* n. 6.—I—V.: n. 17. 20.
- Benfey (Thdr.) Vedica u. Linguistica. 8, 256 S. Strassburg. *Trübner*. n.n. 10. 50.
- Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken. gr. 8. Leipzig. *Breitkopf & Härtel*. n. 9. 50; geb. n. 11. 1—3.: n. 22. 50. Griechische Grammatik v. Gust. Meyer. 494 S. Einleitung in das Sprachstudium. v. B. Delbrück. 149 S.
- Bibliotheca philologica. Hrsg. v. Dr. W. Müldener. 32. Jahrg. 2. Hft, Juli—Decbr., 1879. gr. 8, 135—318 S. n. 1. 80.
- Boetii, Anicii Manlii Severini, commentarii in librum Aristotelis *περὶ ἐμπυρίας*, rec. Car. Meiser. Pars II, 8, 561 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. 6. I. et II.: 8. 70.
- Braun (Dr. Phpp.) Beiträge zur Lehre vom griechischen Pronomen. "Ὅδε u. οὗτος bei Aeschylus. 4, 36 S. Marburg. *Elwert's Verl.* n. 2.
- Breyer (Berth.) Analecta Pindarica. I. Diss. 8, 45 S. Breslau. *Koebner*. baar n. 1.
- Brolen (C. A.) De philosophia L. Aenaei Seneca. 8, 85 pp. Upsala, 1880. 5m. 50p.
- Brugsch Bey (Heinr.) Hieroglyphisch-demotisches Wörterbuch der alten Aegypter. 5 Bd. hoch 4. 464 autogr. S. Leipzig. *Hinrichs' Verl.* Subscr. Pr. n. 116.
- Büdinger (Max). Kleon bei Thukydides, e. krit. Untersuchg. Lex. 8, 48 S. Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n.n. —70.
- Bullinger (Gymn. Prof. Ant.) Aristoteles u. Prof. Zeller in Berlin. gr. 8, 61 S. München. *Th. Ackermann*. n. 1. 20.
- Buschmann (Joh. Carl Ed.) Die Ordinal-Zahlen der mexicanischen Sprache dargestellt. gr. 4, 62 S. Berlin. *Dümmler's Verl. in Comm.* n. 2. 50.

Calvary's philologische u. archaeologische Bibliothek. 48. Bd. u. 49. Bd. 2. Hälfte. 8. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 3. Inhalt: 48. Ueber die Verschiedenheit d. menschlichen Sprachbaues. von Wilh. v. Humboldt, m. erläut. Anmerkgn. u. Excursen, sowie als Einleitg. v. Geh. Reg.-R. Prof. A. F. Pott, Nachträge v. A. F. Pott u. Register v. A. Vaníček. 164 S. n. 2. 49. 2. Hälfte. K. Reisig's Vorlesungen üb. lateinische Sprachwissenschaft. Mit den Anmerkgn. Frdr. Haase bearb. v. Herm. Hagen. 2 Lfg. 97—208 S. n. 1.

Carpenter (Will. H.) Grundriss der neuisländischen Grammatik. gr. 8, 146 S. Leipzig, 1881. *Schlicke.* n. 4.

Colluthi Lycopolitani carmen de raptu Helenae. Ed. Eug. Abel. gr. 8, 140 S. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 4.

Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta. Ed. Thdr. Kock. Vol. I. Antiquae comediae fragmenta. 826 S. Leipzig. *Teubner.* n. 18.

Culmann (F. W.) Neueste Theorie der Palatale in den indoiranischen Sprachen. 8vo, 30 pp. Leipzig, 1880. *F. Fleischer.* 1m.

Daub (Adam). De Suidae biographicorum origine et fide. gr. 8, 90 S. Leipzig. *Teubner.* n. 2.

Deecke (Dr. W.) Etruskische Forschungen. 4. Hft. Das Templum v. Piacenza. Mit 5 (lith.) Taf. gr. 8, 100 S. Stuttgart. *Hetz.* n. 5. 1—4.: n. 30. 70.

De Venus la deesse d'amor. Altfranzösisches Minnagedicht aus dem XIII. Jahrh., zum 1. Male hrsg. v. Wendelin Foerster. 8, 68 S. Bonn. *Cohen & Sohn.* n. 3.

Dido. Tragoedia, ex segmentis priorum librorum Aeneidos composita ab auctore incerto. Ed. W. H. D. Suringar. 8, 70 S. Leipzig. *Harrassowitz.* baar n.n. 1. 60.

Dillmann (A.) Zur Geschichte d. axumitischen Reichs im 4. bis 6. Jahrh. gr. 4, 51 S. Berlin. *Dümmler's Verl.* n. 2. 50.

Dombart (Prof. B.) Üb. die ältesten Ausgaben der Instructionen Commodians. Lex. 8, 29 S. Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n.n. —50.

Egenolff (Petrus). Erotemata grammatica ex arte Dionysiana oriunda. 4, 43 S. Manheim. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* baar n. 1. 60.

Eisenlohr (Prof. Emil). Das lateinische Verbum. gr. 8, 52 S. Heidelberg. *K. Groos.* n. 1.

Erman (Adf.) Neuägyptische Grammatik. Lex. 8, 286 S. Leipzig. *Engelmann.* n. 12.

Eudociae Augustae Violarium, rec. et emendabat, etc. Joa. Flach. 8, 794 S. Leipzig. *Teubner.* 7. 50.

Faulmann (Prof. Carl). Das Buch der Schrift. 2. verm. u. verb. Aufl. hoch 4, 298 S. Wien, k. k. Hof- u. Staatsdr. n. 12.

Forcellini (Aegidius). Totius latinitatis lexicon. Onomasticon. Opera et studio Vinc. De-Vit. Distr. 17. Prati, 1879. Leipzig. *Brockhaus' Sortiment & Antiq.* 4to. II. Bd. p. 497—576. 2m. 50p.

Gietmann (P. Gerardus, S. J.) De re metrica Hebraeorum. gr. 8, 135 S. Freiburg. *Herder.* n. 2. 40.

Gradus ad Parnassum. Recognovit Geo. Aenoth. Koch. 2 voll. Ed. VIII. gr. 8, 440 u. 460 S. Leipzig, 1879. *Hahn's Verl.* 7.

Grein (C. W. M.) Das Hildebrandslied, nach der Handschrift v. Neuem

hrsg., kritisch bearb. Mit e. Photogr. der Handschrift. 2. Aufl. gr. 8, 39 S. Kassel. *Wigand*. n. 2.

Günther (Curt.) Die Verba im Altostfriesischen. Dissertation. gr. 8, 82 S. Leipzig. *Urban*. 2.

Haase (weil. Prof. Frdr.) Vorlesungen üb. lateinische Sprachwissenschaft. 2. Bd. Bedeutungslehre. 2. Thl. hrsg. v. Herm. Peter. gr. 8, 279 S. Leipzig. *Simmel & Co.* n. 7. 20, I. 2.: n. 11. 20.

Harmsen (Thdr.) De verborum collocatione apud Aeschylum, Sophoclem, Euripidem capita selecta. Diss. inauguralis. gr. 8, 44 S. Friburgae. Göttingen. *Akadem. Buchh. in Comm.* baar n. 1.

Hartman (Dr. J. J.) De Hermocopidarum mysteriorumque profanatorum judiciis. gr. 8, 55 S. Leipzig. *Harrassowitz*. baar n.n. 1. 50.

Heine (Dr. Thdr.) De ratione, quae Platoni cum poetis Graecorum intercedit, qui ante eum floruerunt. gr. 8, 73 S. Breslau. *Koebner*. n. 1. 50.

Heinsius (W.) Allgemeines Bücher-Lexikon oder vollständiges alphabet. Verzeichniss aller von 1700 bis Ende 1879 erschienenen Bücher, welche gedruckt worden sind. 16. Bd. Herausgegeben von O. Kistner. 1. u. 2. Lfg. Leipzig, 1880. *Brockhaus*. 4to, 1. Abth. p. 1—160. Jede Lfg. 3m. Schreibpap. 4m.

Heller (Dr. H.) Die Absichtssätze bei Lucian. 1. Teil. "Ἰνα ὥς ἔπος." Aus: "Symbolae Joachimicae." gr. 8, 49 S. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 2. 40.

Hermann (Dr. K. A.) Der einfache Wortstamm u. die drei Lautstufen in der estnischen Sprache, m. vergleich. Hinweisen auf das Suomi. gr. 8, 63 S. Leipzig. *Lorentz*. n. 1.

Hesyhii Milesii qui fertur de viris illustribus librum. Rec., emendavit, apparatus criticum subscripsit Joa. Flach. 8, 71 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. —75.

Heyne (Mor.) Kurze Grammatik der altgermanischen Dialecte. 1. Teil. A. u. d. T.: Kurze Laut- u. Flexionslehre der altgerman. Dialecte. 3. verb. Aufl., 2. Abdr. gr. 8, 366 S. Paderborn. *F. Schöningh*. n. 5.

Hildesheimer (Dr. H.) De libro qui inscribitur de viris illustribus urbis Romae quaestiones historicae. Accedunt variae lectiones trium codicum adhuc in usum non vocatorum. gr. 8, 121 S. Berlin. *Mayer & Müller*. baar n. 2.

Hilgard (Alfr.) De artis grammaticae ab Dionysio Thrace compositae interpretationibus. gr. 4, 52 S. Leipzig. *Teubner in Comm.* n. 2.

Hoffmann (Eman.) Historiae antiquae usque ad Caesaris Augusti obitum libri XII. 8, 279 S. Wien. *Gerold's Sohn*. n. 1. 60.

Holtze (Fr. Guil.) Phraseologia Ciceroniana. gr. 8, 166 S. Naumburg. *Domrich in Comm.* n. 2.

Huemer (Dr. Joh.) Üb. e. Glossenwerk zum Dichter Sedulius. Lex. 8, 49 S. Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n.n. —70.

Huschke (E.) Die neue oskische Bleitafel u. die Pelignische Inschrift aus Corfinium. gr. 8, 98 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. n. 2. 40.

Justi (Ferd.) Kurdische Grammatik. gr. 8, 290 S. St. Petersburg. Leipzig. *Voss' Sort.* n. 3. 70.

Khull (Dr. Ferd.) Üb. die Sprache d. Johannes v. Frankenstein. Lex. 8, 23 S. Graz. *Leuschner & Lubensky in Comm.* n. 1.

Knaack (Geo.) Analecta alexandrino-romana. Diss. gr. 8, 66 S. Gryphiswaldiae. Berlin. *Mayer & Müller*. baar n. 1. 20.

Krall (Dr. Jak.) Manetho u. Diodor. Eine Quellenuntersuchg. Lex. 8, 40 S. Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. —80.

Kraz (Dr. Heinr.) Die drei Reden d. Perikles bei Thukydides, übers. u. erklärt. gr. 8, 47 S. Nördlingen. *Beck*. n. 1.

Lagarde (Paul de). *Orientalia*. 2 Hft. gr. 4, 64 S. Göttingen. *Dieterich's Verl.* n. 3., I. 2.: n. 9.

Langen (Prof. P.) Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung d. Plautus. gr. 8, 352 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. n. 6.

Langguth (Dr. Adf.) Untersuchungen üb. die Gedichte der Ava. gr. 8, 133 S. Budapest. Halle. *Niemeyer*. n. 5.

Lauth (Prof. Dr. F. J.) Aus Aegyptens Vorzeit. 4. u. 5. (Schluss-) Hft. gr. 8, 288—520 S. Berlin. *Th. Hofmann*. à n. 2.

Lauth (F. Jos.) Die Phoenixperiode. 4to, 88pp. München, 1880. *Franz*. 2m. 60p.

Lehmann (Dr. Osk.) Die tachygraphischen Abkürzungen der griechischen Handschriften. gr. 8, 117 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. n. 6.

Lepsius (R.) Nubische Grammatik. Lex. 8, 642 S. Berlin. *Hertz*. geb. n. 26.

Levy (Prof. Dr. J.) Neuhebräisches u. chaldäisches Wörterbuch üb. die Talmudim u. Midraschim. Nebst Beiträgen v. Prof. Dr. H. L. Fleischer. 12 Lfg. hoch. 4. 3. Bd. 113—224 S. Leipzig. *Brockhaus*. à n. 6.

Linke (Dr. Hugo). *Quaestiones de Macrobiani Saturnaliorum fontibus*. gr. 8, 58 S. Breslau. *Koebner*. n. 1. 50.

Lotz (Dr. Wilh.) Die Inschriften Tiglathpileser's I. Mit Beigaben v. Prof. Dr. Frdr. Delitzsch. gr. 8, 240 S. Leipzig. *Henrichs' Verl.* n. 20.

Luckenbach (H.) Das Verhältniss der griechischen Vasenbilder zu den Gedichten d. epischen Kyklos. gr. 8, 148 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. n. 3. 60.

Lycophronis Alexandra. Rec., scholia vetera codicis Marciani addidit Gfr. Kinkel. 8, 206 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. 1. 80.

Lycurgi oratio in Leocratem. Ed. Th. Thalheim. gr. 8, 60 S. Berlin. *Weidmann*. —75.

Mähly (Jak.) Geschichte der antiken Literatur. 2 Theile in 1 Bd. 8, 556 S. Leipzig. *Bibliograph. Institut*. geb. n. 4. 50.

Mayahandschrift (die). Hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. E. Förstemann. Imp.-4., 18 S. Leipzig. *A. Naumann'sche Lichtdruckerei*. baar n.n. 200.

Meklenburg (weil. Rabb. Jakob Zebi.) Hebräischer Commentar zum Pentateuch. 4. Aufl. 2 Bde. gr. 8, 806 S. Frankfurt a M. *Kauffmann*. baar n. 10.

Meingast (Prof. Adalb.) Üb. das Wesen d. griechischen Accentos u. seine Bezeichnung. gr. 8, 55 S. Klagenfurt. Berlin. *Calvary & Co*. baar n. 1.

Merguet (H.) Lexikon zu den Reden d. Cicero m. Angabe sämtlicher Stellen. 2. Bd. 16—19 Lfg. 1, 249 S. Jena. *Fischer*. à n. 2.

Meyer (Wilh.) Die Urbinatische Sammlung v. Spruchversen d. Menander, Euripides u. Anderer. gr. 4., 53 S. München. *Franz in Comm.* n.n. 1. 60.

Mezger (Prof. Frdr.) Pindars Siegeslieder, erklärt. gr. 8, 496 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. n. 8.

Midrasch Kohelet (der), zum ersten Male ins Deutsche übertr. von Dr. Aug. Wünsche. gr. 8., 181 S. Leipzig. *O. Schulze*. n. 4. 50; geb. n. 5.

Miklosich (Dr. Frz.) Über die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europa's. XI. Imp.-4., 53 S. Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 2. 80. I-XI.: n. 37. 40.



Minor, J., u. A. Sauer. Studien zur Goethe-Philologie. gr. 8, 303 S. Wien. *Konegen*. n. 6.

Möllendorf (P. G. v.) Anleitung zur Erlernung der hochchinesischen Sprache. gr. 8, 126 u. chines. Lesebuch 42 S. Shangai. *Görlitz, Tzschaschel*. geb. baar n.n. 15.

Mosbach (Alb.) De Aeneae Tactici poliorcetico. 8, 48 S. Berlin. *Mayer & Müller in Comm.* baar n. 1.

Müller (Prof. Joh.) Emendationen zur naturalis historia d. Plinius. IV. Lex. -8, 34 S. Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n.n.—50. I-IV.: n.n. 2. 10.

Müller (Lucian). Quintus Horatius Flaccus. Eine litterarhistor. Biographie. gr. 8, 154 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. n. 2. 40.

Nicephori opuscula historica. Ed. Car. de Boor. 8, 331 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. 3. 30.

Nohle (Dr. Carl). Die Statslehre Platos in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. gr. 8, 189 S. Jena. *E. Frommann*. n. 4.

Oehler (Wald.) De simplicibus consonis continuis in graeca lingua sine vocalis productione geminatarum loco positis. Diss. gr. 8, 88 S. Leipzig. *Hinrichs' Sort.* baar n. 1. 20.

Oehmichen (Gust). Plinianische Studien zur geographischen u. kunsthistorischen Literatur. gr. 8, 248 S. Erlangen. *Deichert*. n. 4.

Ogonowski (Dr. Emil). Studien auf dem Gebiete der ruthenischen Sprache. gr. 8, 244 S. Lemberg. *Milikowski*. n. 4. 50.

Otto (Aug.) De fabulis Propertianis particula prior. Diss. 8, 52 S. Breslau. *Koebner*. baar n. 1.

Ovidius Naso (P.) Rec. Otto Korn. Tom. II. Metamorphoseon libri XV. gr. 8, 394 S. Berlin. *Weidmann*. 2. 40.

Pabst (Paul). De additamentis quae in Aeschinis orationibus inveniuntur. Diss. 8, 51 S. Vimariae. Jena. *Deistung*. baar n.—80.

Päpke (Willy). Üb. das irische s-praeteritum. Diss. 8, 57 S. Bremen. Jena. *Deistung*. baar n. 1.

Palander (Lehr. E. W.) Uebersicht der neueren russischen Literatur von der Zeit Peters d. Grossen bis auf unsere Tage. 8, 91 S. Tavastehus. Leipzig. *Brockhaus' Sort.* n. 2.

Paucker (C.) Subrelictorum lexicographiae latinae scrutarium. gr. 8, 61 S. Revaliae. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* baar n. 3.

Pauli (Rect. Dr. Carl). Etruskische Studien. 2. Hft. Ueber die etrusk. Formen arñial u. larñial. gr. 8, 76 S. Göttingen. *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* n. 1. 80, 1. u. 2.: n. 4. 20.

Pertsch (W.) Die arabischen Handschriften der herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Gotha. II. Band. 1. u. 2. Hft. Gotha, 1880. *F. A. Perthes*. 8vo, 248. u. p. 241—495. 9 m.

Philologus. Suppl.-Bd. 1. u. 2. Hft. gr. 8. Göttingen. *Dieterich's Verl.* n. 4. Inhalt: 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία. Die att. schrift vom Staat der Athener. Untersuchungen üb. die zeit, die tendenz, die form u. den verfasser derselben. Neue textrecension u. paraphrase. Von Herm. Müller-Strübing. 188 S.

Plinius Secundus (Cajus). Naturgeschichte. Ins Deutsche übers. u. m. Anmerkgn. versehen v. Prof. Dr. G. G Wittstein. 1. Lfg. gr. 8, 160 S. Leipzig. *Gressner & Schramm*. n. 2.

- Plotini Enneades, rec. Herm. Frdr. Müller. Vol. II. gr. 8, 461 S. Berlin. *Weidmann*. 9, I. et II.: 14. 40.
- Plotini Enneaden, übers. v. Herm. Frdr. Müller. 2. Bd. gr. 8, 455 S. Ebd. n. 7, I. u. 2.: n. 11. 80.
- Pomponii Melae de chorographia libri tres. Recognovit Car. Frick. 8, 120 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. I. 20.
- Porphyrii quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquias. Collegit, disposuit, ed. Herm. Schroeder. Fasc. I. gr. 8, 191 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. n. 6.
- Primer (S.) Die consonantische Deklination in den germanischen Sprachen. I. Abth. Die consonant. Deklination im Altnordischen. gr. 8, 64 S. Strassburg. *Trübner*. n. 1.
- Prym, Eug., u. Alb. Socin, der neuaramäische Dialekt d. Tûr Abdîn. 2 The. gr. 8, 287 u. 425 S. Göttingen, 1881. *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* n. 16.
- Publilius Syri Mimi sententiae. Digessit, recensuit, illustravit Dr. Otto Friederich. gr. 8, 314 S. Berlin. *Grieben*. n. 6.
- Raabe (Andr.) Die Klagelieder d. Jeremias u. der Prediger d. Salomon. Mit Anmerkgn. u. e. Glossar versehen. gr. 8, 230 S. Leipzig. *Fernau*. n. 6.
- v. Reinhardtstoettner (C.) Die Plautinischen Lustspiele in späteren Bearbeitungen. I. Amphitruo. Leipzig, 1880. *Friedrich*. 8vo, 80 pp. 2m. 80p.
- Ritschelii (F.) Prolegomena de rationibus criticis grammaticis, prosodiacis, metricis emendationis Plautinae. Ex F. Ritschelii opusculorum philologicorum vol. V seorsum expressa. Leipzig, 1880. *Teubner*. 8vo, 269 pp, 4m.
- Ritter (Dr. Jul.) De titulis graecis christianis commentatio II. gr. 8, 26 S. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 1. 60, I. u. II.: n. 3. 60.
- Romanische Studien. Herausgegeben von Ed. Böhmer. 16. Heft. IV. Bds. 4. Heft. Bonn, 1880. *Weber's Verl.* 8vo, 493—653. 4m.
- Rothstein (Dr. M.) De Tibulli codicibus. gr. 8, 107 S. Berlin. *Mayer & Müller*. baar n. 2.
- Rzach (Alois). Studien zur Technik d. nachhomerischen heroischen Verses. Lex. 8, 194 S. Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 3. 20.
- Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialecte. Hrsg. v. Wilhelm Braune. I. Bd. gr. 8. Halle. *Niemeyer*. n. 2. Inhalt: Gotische Grammatik mit einigen Lesestücken u. Wortverzeichniss v. Wilh. Braune. 124 S.
- Sander (Dr. Max). Der Sprachgebrauch d. Rhetors Annaeus Seneca. II. 4, 25 S. Berlin. *Weidmann*. n. 1. 60, I. u. II.: n. 2. 80.
- Sauppe (Herm.) Attica et Eleusinia. gr. 4, 16 S. Göttingen. *Dieterich's Verl.* baar n. —80. \*
- Schaper (Caroli). Quaestionum Vergilianarum liber I. De eclogis. gr. 8, 36 S. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 2.
- Schneider (G. J.) Quibus ex fontibus petiverit Diodorus libr. III. capp. 1—48. Berlin, 1880. *Calvary & Co.* 8vo, 36 pp. 2m.
- Schneider (Geo. Jul.) De Diodori fontibus, libr. I—IV. gr. 8, 77 S. Berlin. *Weber*. n. 1. 60.
- Schrader (Eb.) Zur Kritik der Inschriften Tiglath-Pileser's II., d. Asarhadon u. d. Asurbanipal. gr. 4, 36 S. Berlin. *Dümmler's Verl in Comm.* cart. n. 3.

Schrader (Prof. Dr. Eb.) Assyrisches Syllabar. 1 Taf. gr. 4. 8 S. Berlin. *Dümmler's Verl.* n. 2.

Sedlmayer (Heinr. Stef.) Kritischer Commentar zu Ovids Heroiden. gr. 8, 78 S. Wien, 1881. *Konegen.* n. 1. 60.

Seebeck (Dr. Joa.) De orationibus Taciti libris insertis. Part I. gr. 4, 24 S. Celle. *Hanover-Schulbuchh.* —30.

Seidel (Heinr. Aug.) Observationum epigraphicarum capita II. Diss. gr. 8, 60 S. Breslau. *Köhler.* baar n. 1.

Sharp (Rob.) De infinitivo Herodoteo. Diss. 8, 45 S. Leipzig. *Simmel & Co.* baar n. 1.

Soltau (Dr. Wilh.) Üb. Entstehung u. Zusammensetzung der altrömischen Volksversammlungen. gr. 8, 718 S. Berlin. *Weidmann.* n. 16.

Sophokles, erklärt v. F. W. Schneidewin. 4. u. 6. Bdchn. gr. 8. Berlin. *Weidmann.* 2. 70. Inhalt: 4. Antigone. 8. Aufl., besorgt v. Aug. Nauck. 176 S. 1. 20. 6. Trachinierinnen. 5. Aufl., besorgt v. Aug. Nauck. 166 S. 1. 50.

Sophokles. Antigone, nebst den Scholien d. Laurentianus hrsg. v. Mor. Schmidt. gr. 8, 147 S. Jena. *Fischer.* n. 2. 80.

Spitta-Bey (Dir. Dr. Wilh.) Grammatik d. arabischen Vulgärdialectes v. Aegypten. gr. 8, 550 S. Leipzig. *Hinrich's Verl.* n. 25.; geb. n. 26.

Starker (Jos.) De Nomophylacibus Atheniensium. Dissertatio inauguralis philologica. 8. 54 S. Breslau. *Koebner.* baar n. 1.

Stein (Rabb. Dr. Leop.) Üb. die Entstehung der Sprache. Die ersten Sprachlehrer d. Menschengeschlechts. gr. 8, 15 S. Zürich. *Verlags-Magazin.* n. —40.

Studien (romanische). Hrsg. v. Ed. Böhmer. 16 Hft. 4. Bds. 4. Hft. gr. 8, 93—652 S. Bonn. *Weber's Verl.* n. 4.

Taciti (P. Cornelii). Opera quae supersunt, edd. Baiterus et Orellius. Ed. 2. Vol. II. Fasc. 2 et 3. 2. Dialogus de oratoribus. Ad fidem codicum optimorum denuo rec. atque interpretatus est Geo. Andresen. 87—146 S. 1877. n. 3. 3. De vita et moribus Julii Agricolae liber. Ad fidem codicum Vaticanorum rec. atque interpretatus est Geo. Andresen. 147—222 S. n. 4. 50.

Thiessen (Jak. H.) Die Legende v. Kisägotamī. Eine literarhistor. Untersuchg. gr. 8, 70 S. Breslau. *Koebner.* n. 2.

Thomas (Emil). Schedae criticae in Senecam rhetorem selectae. Diss. gr. 8, 47 S. Berlin. *Mayer & Müller.* baar n. 1.

Thucydidis de bello peloponnesiaco libri VIII. Explanavit Ernst Frdr. Poppo. Ed. II., quam auxit et emendavit Joa. Matthias Stahl. Vol. III. Sect. II. gr. 8, 219 S. Leipzig. *Teubner.* 2. 40.

Tümpel (Karl). Ares u. Aphrodite. gr. 8, 114 S. Leipzig. *Teubner.* n. 2. 40.

Turmair (Js.) genannt Aventinus, sämtliche Werke. I. Bd. Kleinere historische und philologische Schriften. 1. Hälfte. München, 1880. *Kaiser.* 8vo, 380 pp. 7m. 20p.

Uckermann (Dr. Wilh.) De Aristophanis comici vocabulorum formatione et compositione. gr. 8, 83 S. Marburg, 1879. *Elwert's Verl.* n. 1. 80.

Ulmann u. Brasche. Lettisches Wörterbuch. 2. Thl. Deutsch-lettisches Wörterbuch. gr. 8, 819 S. Riga. *Brutsner & Co.'s Verl.* n. 9, cplt.: n. —12.

Untersuchungen, philologische, hrsg. v. A. Kiessling u. U. v. Wilamowitz-

Moellendorff. 3. Hft. gr. 8. Berlin. *Weidmann*. n. 3. Inhalt: De biographis graecis quaestiones selectae. 169 S.

Vergil's Gedichte. Erklärt v. Th. Ladewig. 3. Bdchn.: Aeneide Buch VII—XII. Mit e. Karte v. H. Kiepert (in Stahlst.) 7 Aufl. v. Gymn.-Dir. Carl Schaper. gr. 8, 303 S. Berlin. *Weidmann*. 2. 25.

Vollgraff (Dr. J. C.) Greek writers of Roman History. Some reflections upon the Authorities used by Plutarch and Appianus. gr. 8, 114 S. Leyden. Leipzig. *Harrassowitz*. baar n.n. 2. 50.

Wahrmund (Doz. Dr. Adf.) Lesebuch in neu-arabischer Sprache. 2. Aufl. 2 Thle. gr. 8. Giessen. *Ricker*. n. 12.

Weber (Maxim.) De Clearchi Solensis vita et operibus. Diss. 8, 48 S. Breslau. *Koebner*. baar n. 1.

Werke, die, der Troubadours, in provenzal. Sprache. Hrsg. v. Dr. C. A. F. Mahn. 3. Bd. 3. Lfg. 8, 129—192 S. Berlin. *Dümmler's Verl.* baar (à) n. 1. 50, I—III, 3. u. IV.: n. 19. 50.

Wiedemann (F. J.) Syrjänisch-deutsches Wörterbuch, nebst einem wotjakisch-deutschen im Anhang, und einem deutschen Register. St. Petersburg, 1880. Leipzig. *Voss' Sort.* 8vo, 706 pp. 7m.

Wissowa (Dr. Geo.) De Macrobii Saturnaliorum fontibus. gr. 8, 56 S. Breslau. *Koebner*. n. 1. 50.

Zingerle (Prof. Dr. Ant.) De carminibus latinis saeculi XV. et XVI. ineditis. gr. 8, 212 S. Innsbruck. *Wagner*. n. 4.

Zinzow (Gymn.-Dir. Dr. Adf.) Psyche u. Eros. gr. 8, 362 S. Halle, 1881. *Buchh. d. Waisenh.* n. 6.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aristophanis *Lysistrata*, etc. Instruxit F. H. M. Blaydes. Halis Saxonum, 1880. 6m.

Aristophanis *Thesmophoriazusae*. Annotatione critica, commentario exegetico et scholiis graecis, instruxit Fredericus H. M. Blaydes. Halis Saxonum. *In Orphanotrophei Libraria*. 1880. 5m.

De Libro qui inscribitur de viris illustribus urbis Romae. Scr. H. Hildesheimer. Berlin. *Mayer & Müller*, 1880.

Einleitung in das Studium des Angelsächsischen. Von Karl Körner. I, II. Heilbronn. *Gebr. Henninger*. 1878, 1880.

Principien der Sprachgeschichte. Von Hermann Paul. Halle. *Max Niemeyer*, 1880.

### ERRATA.

p. 401, l. 1, for II 19, 19, read IV 7, 57.

457, l. 7 from bottom, read 'he will be able to recall.'

458, l. 20 from bottom, for 'word' read 'work.'



# INDEX VOL. I.

Ablaut I, Greek formations with,	314	Aristophanes, Acharn. 540,	455
Ablaut II, " " "	318	Acharn. 790,	456
Ablaut III, " " "	320	Aves 1245, 1494,	456
Accent, effect of on roots,	311	Ran. 1443-9,	456
Accentuation, Greek law of,	311	Vespae, 1031 foll.,	78
Acharnae, rock tomb at,	104	Parodos of,	402
Achilleian books of the Iliad,	34	Arnold's Beowulf,	89
Adjectives in -ωπός,	131	Arnoldt, Die Chorpartien bei Aristophanes,	402
Aeginetan marbles, grouping of,	374	Article, Apollonios Dyscolos on,	239
Aeschylus' Agamemnon, notes on, by		Asinus of Lucian, character of the,	365
Lewis Campbell,	427	Athenaion, report of,	103-105
55,	420	Athenian Archons, how appointed,	230
70, 71,	429	Atreidae, Aeschylus' account of the,	427
105-7, 140-4,	430	Attic Archons, from Ol. 119, 4 to Ol. 123, 4,	240
196-7, 201, 224, 249-52,	431	Attic orthography,	75
276, 286-9,	432	Attis of Catullus,	101
304, 314, 336, 413,	433	Authors quoted by Verrius Flaccus,	260
494, 534, 612,	434	Avesta — word of God,	212
615-6, 637, 767, 817, 864, 871, 933-4,	435	Bährens' treatment of Propertius,	389
982-6, 1114-8,	436	Bakhuyzen on parody in Aristophanes,	455
1137, 1172, 1181, 1271-2, 1300, 1327-30,	437	Bang on the Voluspá,	440
1331-1343,	105	Bacon, Roger, quoted,	273
1343, 1391-2,	437	Bacon, Sir F., quoted,	274
1395, 1458, 1596, 1625-7, 1657,	438	Badham on Dem. de Corona, § 147,	109
Aesch. Prom., 43,	82	Barth's les Religions de l'Inde, notice of,	347
Ahrens on Olympian Inscription No. 111,	238	Bartsch on Celtic verse,	443
Ai and ei in the Austrian dialect,	222	Behagel on <i>mir</i> and <i>mik</i> in Low Ger-	
Albert, M., on a villa of Tusculum,	97	man,	220
Alemannia,	505	Beowulf, Gering on Arnold's,	90
ALLEN, F. D., etymological and gram-		<i>Berones</i> , meaning of,	378
matical notes,	127-145	Bistāni's Arabic Encyclopaedia,	502
ALLINSON, F. G., a proposed redistribu-		Blass on the new fragments of Euripides,	236
tion of the Parodos of the <i>Vespae</i> ,	402	Boccaccio's Teseide and Chaucer's	
Note on <i>πῆλαρ</i> as an adjective,	458	Knights Tale,	227
Alliteration, E. Wilken on,	222	Boeotian vocalism,	106
<i>Amoenus</i> , ancient explanation of,	254	Bompois on an Etruscan drachma,	97
Anderson, Professor, death of,	511	On coins of Populonia,	98-100
Andocides in Alcib. 18,	7	BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE, on the Greek	
Andreas, on the poem,	371	<i>Ablaut</i> ,	281
Anglia,	88-96, 367-372, 491-497	BRANDT, H. C. G., on Recent Investiga-	
Antimachus, popularity of, in the age of		tions of Grimm's Law,	146-160
Hadrian,	490	Notice of Hewett's Frisian Language	
Antiphon de Caede Herodis,	5	and Literature,	74
Apollonios Dyscolos on article,	239	Notice of Braune's Gotische Gramma-	
Apsaras, the,	215	tik,	474
Archaeologische Zeitung,	481	Notice of Zeitschrift für Orthographie,	506
Aristot. Met., A 7, p. 1072, b. 2,	66	Bréal on the Frates Arvales,	244

- BROWN, FRANCIS, review of Murray's  
Origin and Growth of the Psalms, 357  
Brugman, K., on nasal vowels, 282  
Brunn on Stark's views of the Laocoon, 481  
Bücheler on the new fragments of Euripides, 231  
Byron, Pope's influence on, 91  
Caesar, B. G. III, 7 and 8, 377  
CAMPBELL, LEWIS, Notes on the Agamemnon of Aeschylus, 427  
Canephoros, early representation of, 485  
Canticum de Creatione, 92  
CARTER, F. J., Two German Scholars on one of Goethe's Masquerades, 16-31  
Catullus, the *Datanus* of, 390  
Caste, Schlagintweit on, 214  
Catalan treatises of grammar and poetic, 113, 508  
Celestinus, legend of, 89  
Chaironeia, Lion of, 105  
Charlemagne, Pèlerinage de, 507  
Chaucer's Assembly of Foules, 228  
Knights Tale, 227  
Legend of St. Caecilia, Kölbing on, 227  
Miller's Tale, 89  
Chaucer's influence on James I. of Scotland, 493  
Choricus, Apology of the Mimes, 78  
Christ's Metrik, Löbbach on, 376  
Cicero de domo, Karsten on, 366  
Cicero's Correspondence with Brutus defended as genuine by Cobet, 361  
Cic. ad Att. 4, 15, 8, 480  
Cic. Phil. II 3, 6; 9, 21; 14, 35; 18, 44; III 11, 27; V 4, 10; 12, 31; VII 6, 16; VIII 6, 16, 19; X 3, 6; 7, 15; 8, 16, 108  
Citania, Antiquities of, 379  
Cleomenes, the sculptor, 483  
Clough's Study of the Hexameter of Virgil, 69  
Cobet on Cicero's Philippics, 107  
On Eunapius, 475  
On Thucydides, 477-479  
Coincide, Coincidence, history of, 271  
Commodus, a decree of, 489  
Compounds, Cobet on new, 363  
*Congruere, congruens*, use of, 272  
Contes populaires lorrains, 507  
Conze on Cybele and Kadmilos, 483  
Cook, A. S., Report of Kölbing's Studien, 225-229  
The word 'weasand,' 61-64  
Skeat's Etymological Dictionary, 203  
Corinna, fr. 20 Bgk., 65  
Cornificius 2, 22, 34, 488  
Correspondence of Ibn Sab'in, 218  
Cornu on Spanish and Portuguese phonology, 508  
Crowe on the Book of Ballymote, 447  
Cult of the *Divi*, 85  
Curtius, E., on Sparta and Olympia, 101  
Cynewulf, 94  
Dante, Inferno I 28, 29, 234  
DAVIDSON, THOMAS, The Dionysion at Marathon, 58  
Aristot. Metaphys. A 7, p. 1072, b. 2, 65  
Corinna, fr. 20 (Bgk.), 65  
Pausanias, I 26, 5 (6), 66  
Report of Athenion, 103-105  
Vincent and Dickson's Hand-Book to Modern Greek, 72  
Democritus, *περί ἐνθυμίας*, 102  
Demosthenes, de Cor. § 147, 109  
" § 289, 75  
in Mid. § 10, 77  
de Halon., 6  
Derivations, absurd Stoic, 367  
Desjardins on the cult of the *Divi*, 85  
On Horace's Journey to Brundisium, 81  
D'OOGHE, M. L., Report of Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, 373-376  
Dio Chrysostomus and his use of the negative, 48, 50, 53, 57  
Dionysion at Marathon, 66  
Dittenberger on the Ionic vowel-system, 486  
Droysen's Alexander the Great, notice of, 347  
Dryden's paraphrases of Chaucer, 370, 491  
Edda, the, and the Sibylline Books, 440  
Edzardi on Irish forms of verse, 443  
Eichhorst on Apollonios Dyscolos, 239  
Eleusis and Delphi, 105  
ELLIOTT, A. M., Report of Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, 232-235  
Notice of Knapp's *Lecturas de Clase*, 475  
On Romance Philology in America, 208-210  
ELLIS, ROBINSON, The *Neapolitanus* of Propertius, 389  
On a Bodleian MS. of Ovid's *Ars Am.*, 490  
Elymaeans, the, 487  
*Eo*, forms of the perfect of, 378  
Epitaph of Geminia Titulla, 99  
*Equidem*, use of, 356  
Eros at Doughty House, 481  
*Esquiliae*, origin of, 379  
Ethics, Nicom. of Arist., 376  
Etymological and Grammatical Notes, 128  
Etymologies:  
English: bless, left (adj.), 493  
dowager, 205  
ease, eld, 206  
flagon, flask, flat, flatter, fleet, foil, gate, how, ladle, mate, why, 205  
weasand, 61  
French: banquet, cuisençon, froisser, malade, meuble, otage, 235  
German: weisen, 61  
Greek: see under *Greek*.  
Italian: andare, fandonia, nocchiere, putto, 235

- Latin: intrare, 143-145  
       macte, 135-140  
       penetrare, 143-145  
       siremps, 135  
       temperare, 140-143  
 Portuguese: cito, 235  
 Etymology as treated by Varro and Verrius  
       Flaccus, 260  
 Euripides, Fragment of, 193  
       New fragments of, 229-236  
       Alceſtis, 403, 451  
       Heracl. 906-909, Iph. A. 1002, Frag. 977,  
       Frag. 1039, 238  
       Orestes parodied, 366  
 Excavations at Olympia, 485  
*Evocati*, 102  
 Faust, Marlowe's, 370  
 FAY, E. A., Imperfect and Pluperfect  
       Subjunctive in the Roman Folk-  
       Speech, 410  
 Féraut, Raymon, 506  
 Festus Pompeius, his date, etc., 253  
 Firkowitsch, frauds of, 498  
 Fleckeisen's Emendations of Plautus, 354  
 Förster on Umlaut im Romanischen, 232  
 Fourth play in the tetralogy, 187-196  
 Fragment of Euripides, 193  
 Fratres Arvales, Bréal on, 244  
 Future imperat., forms of Latin, 372  
 Gaebler on the A. S. poem Phoenix, 496  
 Gallus, so-called fragments of, 231  
 GARNER, S., report of Romania, 111-116, 506-510  
       On 'Je ne sache pas,' 197-202  
 GARNETT, JAMES M., report of Anglia, 88-96, 367-372, 491-497  
 Gellius, A., quotations from Verrius Flac-  
       cus, 258  
 General Semitic Grammar, problems of, 416  
 Gering on Beowulf, 492  
 Germania, report of, by C. F. Raddatz, 219-225  
 GILDERSLEEVE, B. L., Encroachments of  
       μή on οἱ in Later Greek, 45-60  
       Rev. of Tyler's selections from the  
       Greek Lyric Poets, 73  
       Rev. of Wheeler on the Interpolations  
       in Euripides, 72  
       Rev. of G. Meyer's Griechische Gram-  
       matik, 463  
       Rev. of Butcher and Lang's tr. of the  
       Odyssey, 466  
       Rev. of Merriam's Phaeacians, 468  
       Rev. of Dunbar's Concordance to the  
       Odyssey, 473  
 Goebel on the axes of Od. 19, 598, 468  
 Goedike's der Accusativ im Veda, notice  
       of, 350  
 GOODWIN, W. W., Δίκαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων  
       and δίκαι συμβόλαι, 4-16  
 Goldziher on popular poetry in Cairo, 214  
 Graecizing school of Etymology at Rome, 263  
 Graux on Philo Byzantinus, 87  
 Greek:  
       ἀγριωπός, 130  
       αἱματωπός, 130  
       αἰζήλος, 59  
       ἀλφειστής, 467  
       ἀμφιέλισσαι, 467  
       ἀνοίγω, Xen. Hell. I 1, 2, etc., emended, 373  
       ἀντωπός, 130  
       ἀπολείπεσθαι, meaning of, 366  
       ἀστερωπός, 130  
       αὐλωδία, Guhrauer on, notice of, 374  
       ἄωρος, 467  
       βίω, use of in Lucian, 364  
       γοργωπός, 130  
       δαίφρων, 133-135  
       δεύτερος, derivation of, 381  
       δίκαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων, 4  
       δοκιμασία, Thalheim on, notice of, 374  
       δοξαστικόν, τὸ, meaning of in Aristotle, 376  
       ἐα, 454  
       ἐθνός = *provincia* in Appian, 378  
       θέσει in prosody, 231  
       θεωρός, 131-132  
       κοίλωπός, 131  
       λογιστικόν, τὸ, in Aristotle, meaning of, 376  
       μαρτυρεῖσθαι, meaning of, 365  
       μέμφομαι, 453  
       μή, causal, 53  
       μή, participial, 55  
       μή, with oratio obliqua infinitive, 48  
       μή, relative, 54  
       νυκτερωπός, 131  
       ξυμβόλαιαι δίκαι, 4  
       ὁμόγραμμα and ὁμογράμματος, 364  
       ὅτι μή, 50  
       παρθενωπός, 131  
       περιαίρειν, meaning of, 365  
       ποιέω, 132-133  
       πίαρ, 458  
       πρό, sense of, 377  
       πυρωπός, 130  
       ρήτρα, 239  
       σέβομαι, derivation of, 382  
       σκνῶρωπός, 130  
       τηλουρός, 127-131  
       τηλωπός, 130  
       τιμηθήσομαι, 231  
       φαιδρωπός, 130  
       φλογωπός, 130  
 Grein, C. W. M., on Anglo-Saxon, 88  
 Grettissage and Beowulf, 492  
 Grimm's Law, Recent Investigations of, 146-160  
       Exceptions to, 312  
 Grote's view of the Iliad, 32-33  
 Guna as applied to Greek roots, 285  
 Gylfaginning, sources of the, 504  
 H dropped before w, 64

Haldeman, Prof., death of,	512	On recent Publications in the field of	
Halévy on the Inscription of Byblos,	217	Indian Antiquities,	345
HART, J. M., Keltic and Germanic,	440	Lanx Saturā,	241-244, 381-2, 514-5
Hartmann von der Aue,	221	Laocoon, Stark on the,	481
Harpocraton, an unedited letter of,	80	La Roche,	24
Hartung on <i>οὐ</i> and <i>μή</i> (note),	45	Latin plural of respect,	373
Heilprin's Historical Poetry of the Hebrews, reviewed,	469-473	Latin poetry,	232
Hennig on the relation of Southey to Byron,	496	Latin, traces of Ablaut in,	306
Hermann, G., on <i>οὐ</i> and <i>μή</i> ,	45	Layamon,	91
Herbst on Thucydides,	240	Layamon's verse, Trautmann on,	368
Hindu medicine, Arabic sources of,	501	Leabhar Breac,	442
Hirzel on Democritus' <i>περὶ εὐθυμίας</i> ,	102	Leabhar na huidre,	445
Horace, Journey to Brundisium,	81	Leuchsenring,	23
Epist. lib. II, Mommsen on,	380	Lincke on Xenophon's Oeconomicus,	170
Od. 3, 14, 12,	78	Lion of Chaireneia,	105
3, 23, 16-20,	83	Livy, lib. XXI 3, 7, 8, 10, 17, 25, 28, 31, 36,	
19, 578,	480	38, 40, 41, 43, 49, 52, 59,	106
Holtzmann on the Apsaras,	215	LODEMAN, A., Note on <i>je ne sache pas</i> ,	460
Homeric Poems, Kiene on, notice of,	377	Lohmann on omission of English relative pronoun,	492
Homer: Il. 2, 291,	242	Sattler on,	495
Il. 2, 318, 319,	59	Longinus, Cobet's view of,	366
Il. 15, 41,	45	Lounsbury's History of the English Language,	497
Huchown,	89	Lucian, Vera Historia A 22, B 45,	242
Hübner on the bust of Seneca,	484	Herwerden's emendations of,	363
HUMPHREYS, M. W., Clough's Study of the Hexameter of Virgil,	69	Use of the negative in,	47
Report on Revue de Philologie,		Piscat. 21,	481
75-87, 229-232, 372-3		Lysias, chronology of orations of,	379
Report of Rheinisches Museum,	235-237	Madvig on the <i>praelecti</i> ,	82
On the Fourth Play in the Tetralogy, 187-196		Māitrayani Samhita,	212
Varia,	453	Malum,	84
Indo-Germanic pronoun,	211	Marathon, battle of,	105
Inferior, posterior quam,	231	Massinger, J. Phelan on,	367
Ink with metallic base in ancient times,	231	McCrindle's translation of works relating to India, notice of,	347
Inscriptions, size of letters in Greek,	488	Merck,	24
Ionic vowel-system,	486	MERRIAM, A. C., On Il. II 318, 319,	59
Ireland and its relation to the Voluspā and the Sibylline books,	441	Merriam's Phaeacian Episode of the Odyssey,	468
Irish forms of verse,	443	Michaelis on Eros,	481
Jacobsthal on the Musical MS. of Montpellier,	233	On the metrological bas-relief of the Arundelian Marbles,	482
<i>Je ne sache pas</i> ,	197, 460	On the sculptor Cleomenes,	483
Jubainville on Bartsch's Keltic verse,	444	<i>Mir</i> and <i>Mik</i> in Low German,	220
Kaegi's Rigveda, notice of,	341	Mnemosyne, Report of, 107-111, 361-67, 476-81	
Kālakācārya-Kathānakam,	499	Mommsen on the Roman guards,	100
Keltic and Germanic, by J. M. Hart,	440	On representation of <i>ϕ</i> in Roman writing,	101
Kert (Iranian),	211	MORRIS, C. D., Report of Mnemosyne,	
Klügmann on the <i>regiones</i> of Rome,	486	107-111, 360-67, 476-81	
King's Quair, the,	493	On Xenophon's Oeconomicus,	169-186
KNAPP, W. T., on the Catalogue of Ticknor's Spanish Library,	344	MS. authority, value of,	393
Knapp's Lecturas de Clase,	475	Müller, E., on a Byzantine toothpick,	98
Kölbing's Englische Studien,	225-232	Müller, K. O., ed. of Festus,	255
Kühner on <i>οὐ</i> and <i>μή</i> ,	46	Müller-Strübing on the battle of Marathon,	105
Kyzikos, inscription from,	380	Murray, A. S., on the E. frieze of the Parthenon,	99
Lactantius, Phoenix of,	236	Murray, T. C., Origin and Growth of the Psalms reviewed,	357
LANMAN, C. R., Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar,	68		

- Musical MS. of Montpellier, 233  
 Mycenae, no mention of, in Aeschylus, 427  
 Naber, emendations of Greek comic poets, 477  
 Nasal vowels, 292  
 Nâsir Chusran, 215  
 Nauplia, rock tomb at, 104  
 NETTLESHIP, H., on Verrius Flaccus, 253  
 Noun-inflections in Semitic, 421  
 O'CONNOR, B. F., Orthography of French verbs ending in *-eler* and *-eter*, 161-168  
 O'Curry on the Book of Ballymote, 447  
 Oculist's stamps, 100  
 Odyssey, Butcher and Lang's translation of, 466  
 Odyssey, Phaeacian episode of the, 468  
*Olea, oliva*, Jordan on, 379  
 Olshausen on Storax, 101  
 Olympia, excavations at, 485  
 Ormulum, Kölbing on the, 226  
 Ortaye, the, 211  
 Orthography of French verbs in *-eler* and *-eter*, 161-168  
 PACKARD, L. R., Geddes' problem of the Homeric poems, 32-44  
 Palatal consonants, theory of, 282, 301  
 Palmer's treatment of Propertius, 389  
 Paragoric *-w* in Layamon, 497  
 Paris, G., on the Life of St. Alexis, 112  
 Parodos of the Vespae, 402  
 Parthenon, the eastern frieze of, 99  
 Paul on sound development and form association, 503  
     On the weak preterit of the Germanic language, 503  
 Paul u. Braune's Beiträge, 502  
 Paulus' abridgment of Festus, 254  
 Pausan. I 26, 5, 66  
 Pederasty in Plat. Symp., 375  
 Pehlevi coins, 211, 497  
 Phaeacians, notice of Merriam's, 468  
 Phaidros of Plato, date of, 237  
 Philological work of early Latin poets, 256  
 Philologus, Report of, 237-241  
 Phoenix, A. S. poem, 496  
 Phoenix of Lactantius, 236  
 Phonology of Semitic, 417  
     Spanish and Portuguese, 508  
 Plautus, Asin. 729, 355  
     Bentley's emendations of, 352  
     Capt. 807, 321, 355  
     Epidicus, 110  
     64, 65, emended, 377  
     Parabasis in Curculio, 380  
 Pliny, N. H. 17 1, 1, emended, 363  
     34, 37, 484  
 Plural of respect in Latin, 373  
 Plutarch, Apophtheg. Lac. 215, 9  
 Poema morale, 88  
*Pomerium*, origin of, 379  
 Ponte San Sisto, age of, 486  
 Pontifices minores, 362  
 Pope's influence on Byron, 91  
     Rape of the Lock, Robertag on, 229  
 Porcia, wife of Brutus, 362, 380  
*Positione* in prosody, 231  
 Pott on the Indo-Germanic pronoun, 211  
*Praefecti* in the last period of the Roman Republic, 82  
 Pravargja ceremony, the, 500  
 Prefixes in Semitic, 420  
 Pre-Socratic philosophy, 376  
 PRICE, THOMAS R., Report of Philologus, 237  
 Pronouns in Semitic, 428  
 Propertius, MSS. of, 394  
     II 3, 22 (p. 393), 9, 21 (p. 397), 23, 2 (p. 396), 24, 17 (p. 396), 25, 41, 42 (p. 398), 26, 43, 44 (p. 398), 32, 33, 34 (p. 398), 33, 37 (p. 397).  
     III 1, 23 (p. 396), 5, 7 (p. 396), 11, 13, 14 (p. 398), 15, 32 (p. 396), 24, 6 (p. 399).  
     IV 1, 31 (p. 396).  
 Psalms, Murray on the, 357  
 Pyrrhic dance connected with Neoptolemus, 365  
 Qadishaye, the, 211  
*-Que, -ve, -ne* after short *e*, 230  
 Quint. 10, 1, 66, 230  
 RADDATZ, C. F., Report of Germania, 219-225  
 Recent Publications, 118, 245, 383, 516  
 Regiones of Rome, Klügmann on, 486  
 Relative Pronoun, omission of in English, 492  
 Reports:  
     Alemannia, 505  
     Anglia, 88, 367, 491  
     Athenaion, 103  
     Englische Studien, 225  
     Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, 105, 373  
     Germania, 219  
     Hermes, 100, 379  
     Journal Asiatique, 217  
     Mnemosyne, 107, 361, 475  
     Paul u. Braune's Beiträge, 502  
     Philologus, 237  
     Revue Archéologique, 97  
     Revue de Philologie, 75, 229, 379  
     Rheinisches Museum, 235  
     Romania, 111  
     Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 211-217, 497-502  
     Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 232  
 Reviews: Bentley's Emendationen zum Plautus, 351  
     Butcher and Lang's Odyssey, 466  
     Catalogue of Ticknor's Spanish Library, 344  
     Clough's Hexameter, 69  
     Dunbar's Concordance to Odyssey, 403  
     Hewett's Frisian Language, 74  
     Merriam's Phaeacians, 468  
     Mallery's Sign Language of the North American Indians, 206



Meyer's Griechische Grammatik,	463	Sign Language,	206
Murray's Origin and Growth of the Psalms,	357	SIHLER, E. G., Report of Hermes,	100-103, 379-381, 485-490
Recent American Publications in Romance Philology and Literature,	208	Of Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher,	105
Recent Publications in the Field of Indian Antiquities,	345	Skeat's Etymological Dictionary, rev. by	
Roby's Latin Grammar for Schools,	464	A. S. Cook,	203
Skeat's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language,	203	Solon, fr. 36, 18-21 (Bgk.),	458
Tyler's Greek Lyric Poets,	73	Soma,	211
Vincent and Dickson's Handbook to Modern Greek,	70	Sonnenschein's Bentley's Emendationen zum Plautus, notice of,	351
Wheeler's De Alcesti et Hippolyti Interpolationibus,	72	Southey and Byron,	496
Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar,	68, 348	Sparta and Olympia,	101
Revue Archéologique,	97-100	Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar,	494
Revue de Philologie,	75-87, 229, 372	Stattius, Achilleis 178,	363
Rheinisches Museum, Report of,	235	Stems in Semitic,	420
Richtofen's China,	499	Stichometry, researches in,	80
Rigveda 5, 2, 1-6,	211	Stokes on the Keltic names in the Landnama-Bók,	443
Ritschl's emendations of Plautus,	354	Storax,	101
River names, German,	505	Subjunctive Imperf. and Pluperf. in Roman Folk-speech,	410
Roby's Latin Grammar for Schools, reviewed,	464	Suffixes in Semitic,	420
Rock tombs at Nauplia,	103	Susanna, legend of,	89
at Acharnae,	104	Sweet,	93
Roman Folk-Speech, Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunc. in,	410	Syntax, descriptive and historical,	223
Romance Philology and Literature in America,	208-210	Talents, Egyptian value of,	375
Romania, Report of,	111-116, 506-510	Ten Brink on English phonology,	95
Rome, Unger on founding of,	235	History of Eng. Lit.,	369
Roots, Greek, views of,	283	Theophilus Legend, Kolbing on the,	226
Rûsânainâma, the,	215	Theopompus (?), fragments of,	488-9
St. Grégoire, vie de,	506	Thespiades, the,	484
St. Guthlac, Anglo-Sax. poems on,	370	Thuc. 1, 10, 2; 31, 3; 32, 3; 34, 1, 77,	477
St. Honorat, vie de,	506	1, 54; 73, 1; 1, 115, 5; 137, 4; 2, 12, 4,	478
St. Wenefrede,	494	2, 35, 1,	106
Sassanian coins found near Bautzen,	498	2, 77, 1; 80, 2; 91, 1; 3, 38, 1; 84; 6, 2, 5, 6,	479
SAVAGE, A. D., Report on Revue Archéologique,	96-100	Timayenis, Aesop's Fables,	242
SHEPHERD, H. E., on 'Coincide' and 'Coincidence,'	271-280	Tongues of animals, sacrifice of,	375
Scherer on the Jahrmarktsfest zu Plundersweilern,	18	Tov, C. H., Mallory's Sign Language, Review of,	206-208
Schlagintweit on Caste,	214	Heilprin's Historical Poetry of the Hebrews, review of,	469-473
Schmidt, A., on Shakespeare Criticism,	491	Problems of General Semitic Grammar,	416
Schmidt, Johannes, on the <i>Evocati</i> ,	102	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellschaft,	211-217, 497-502
Scholia in Odyssæam, Cobet on,	367	Journal Asiatique,	217
Schröder, L., on the Maitrâyanî-Samhitâ, notice of,	348	Trautmann on Sweet,	93
Schroeder, L. A. P., Bentley's Emendationen zum Plautus, notice of,	351	Trilateral roots in Semitic,	418
Seneca, Tranquil. An. 2, 6; 10, 3,	238	Tümpel on the dialects of the old Low Saxon territory,	503
Seneca, portrait of,	484	Turkoman language,	213
Shakespeare, criticism of texts of,	491	Tusculum, a villa of,	97
Sibilants in Semitic,	418	Tyler's selections from the Greek lyric poets,	73
Sibylline books source of the Edda,	440	Unger on Attic Archons,	240
Sievers on Zupitza's edition of Cynewulf,	96	Usener on the date of the Phaidros,	237
		On <i>tempus</i> and <i>templum</i> ,	140
		Vambéry on the Turkoman language,	213

- Varro, de Ling. lat., probable sources, 257  
*De Verborum Significatu*, character of, 256  
 Mode of citation in, 264  
 Vendidad, third chapter of, 500  
 Vergil, date of Ecl. X, 377  
 Georg. I 221-222, 85  
 Aen. I, vv. 188, 395, 455, 653, 107  
 Verner's Law, 156, 282, 505  
 Verrius Flaccus, life and works of, 255  
 Vinayapitaka, Oldenberg's, 498  
 Vincent and Dickson's Handbook to  
 Modern Greek, 70  
 Vingt-sept ans d'Histoire des Études  
 Orientales, notice of Mohl's, 346  
 Vowels, nasal, 292  
 Vowels, original I. E. 291  
 Voluspá, Edzardi on the, 220  
 Ward's Chaucer, J. Koch on, 497  
 WARREN, M., on Bentley's emendations  
 of Plautus, recently published, 351  
 Review of Roby's Latin Grammar for  
 Schools, 464  
 Review of Weinkauff's Dialogus of  
 Tacitus, 474  
 Weak preterit of the Germanic languages, 503  
 Weber's Indische Streifen, notice of, 345  
 Weil on the New Fragments of Euripides, 229  
 Weinkauff's Dialogus of Tacitus, 275  
 Wentzel, über den Instrumentalis im Rig-  
 veda, notice of, 350  
 Wheeler, De Alcestidis et Hippolyti Eu-  
 ripiderum Interpolationibus, 72  
 WHITNEY, W. D., on Logical consistency  
 in views of language, 327  
 Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar, notice of,  
 68, 348  
 Wilamowitz on Phaedon of Elis, 101  
 Gallambi of Callimachus and Catullus, 101  
 Wilmanns on the Jahrmachtsfest zu Plun-  
 dersweilern, 18  
 Winer on *ἦν* and *μῆν*, 45  
 Wolfian hypoth. of Homer, Kiene on, 377  
 Wood on Chaucer's influence upon James  
 I. of Scotland, 493  
 Wülcker on Arnold's Beowulf, 90  
 Cynewulf, 94  
 Grein, 92  
 Külbinger's Englische Studien, 92  
 Xenophon, Hell. I 1, 2, etc., emended, 373  
 Xenophon's Oeconomicus, 169-186  
 Xenophon's Symposium, Rettig on, 238  
 Zanzibar, Arabic dialect of, 499  
 Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländis-  
 chen Gesellschaft, 211-217, 497-502  
 Zeitschrift für Orthographie, 506  
 Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 232-235  
 Zenobia, her relations with Longinus, 366  
 Zimmer's Altindisches Leben, notice of, 347